3 1761 06557942 7

Presented to the

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

by the

ONTARIO LEGISLATIVE
LIBRARY

1980

695

904
N84

Now publishing, thoroughly revised, fcp. 8vo. at 3s. 6d. or 5s. per volume,

THE

ALDINE EDITION OF THE BRITISH POETS.

THE general principle which has been adopted in this Edition, is *to give the entire Poems of each author in strict conformity with the edition which received his final revision, to prefix a Memoir, and to add such notes as may be necessary to elucidate the sense of obsolete words or explain obscure allusions.* Each author will be placed in the hands of a competent editor specially acquainted with the literature and bibliography of the period.

AKENSIDE'S POETICAL WORKS; with Memoir, by the Rev. A. DYCE, and Additional Letters. Carefully revised, price 5s. [*Ready.*

SHAKESPEARE'S POEMS; with Memoir, by the Rev. A. DYCE. Price 5s. [*Ready.*

GRAY'S POETICAL WORKS; with Notes and Memoir, by the Rev. JOHN MITFORD. Price 5s. [*Ready.*

COLLINS'S POEMS; with Memoir and Notes, by W. MOY THOMAS, Esq. Price 3s. 6d. [*Ready.*

YOUNG'S POEMS; with Memoir, by the Rev JOHN MITFORD, and Additional Poems. 2 vols. price 10s. [*Shortly.*

COWPER'S POETICAL WORKS; including his Translations from MILTON, MADAME GUYON, &c. Edited, with Memoir, by JOHN BRUCE, Esq. F.S.A. 3 vols. [*In Preparation.*

POPE'S POETICAL WORKS; with Memoir, by W. J. THOMS, Esq. F.S.A. 3 vols. [*In Preparation.*

PARNELL'S POEMS; with Memoir. Edited by BOLTON CORNEY, Esq. [*In Preparation.*

THOMSON'S POEMS; with Memoir, by Sir H. NICOLAS, and additional Poems. The whole very carefully revised, and the Memoir annotated by PETER CUNNINGHAM, Esq. F.S.A. [*In the Press.*

DRYDEN'S POETICAL WORKS; with Memoir, by the Rev. RICHARD HOOPER, F.S.A. 5 vols. [*In Preparation.*

Uniform with the above.

SHAKESPEARE'S DRAMATIC WORKS. The Text completely revised, with Notes and Various Readings, by S. W. SINGER, F.S.A. In 10 vols. 6s. each.

Also, A LARGE-PAPER EDITION, price £4. 10s.

BACON'S ESSAYS, with the WISDOM of the ANCIENTS. With a revised Text, References, and Notes. By S. W. SINGER, F.S.A. 5s.

GEORGE HERBERT'S TEMPLE, and other POEMS. With S. T. COLERIDGE'S Notes. Price 5s.

The PHYSICAL THEORY of ANOTHER LIFE. By ISAAC TAYLOR, Esq., Author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm," &c. Price 6s.

Also a handsomely-printed Edition in 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

The WORKS of THOMAS GRAY; with Life, by the Rev. JOHN MITFORD. 5 vols. price 25s.

BISHOP TAYLOR'S RULE and EXERCISES of HOLY LIVING and DYING. 2 vols. price 8s.; or 1 vol. 7s. 6d.

VAUGHAN'S (HENRY) SILEX SCINTILLANS; or, SACRED POEMS and PIOUS EJACULATIONS; with a Memoir, by the Rev. H. F. LYTE. New Edition, carefully revised. Price 5s. [*In the Press.*

Handsomely printed by Whittingham, in 8vo.

The Library of English Worthies.

In this Series the Works of each Author will be carefully collated with the Early Copies, and no effort will be spared to render these the best Editions extant.

GOWER'S CONFESSIO AMANTIS, with Life, by Dr. PAULI; and a Glossary. 3 vols. price £2. 2s.; or in antique calf for a present, £3. 3s. [*Ready.*

Only a limited number of copies printed.

BISHOP TAYLOR'S RULE and EXERCISES of HOLY LIVING and DYING. 2 vols. price £1. 1s.; or in antique calf for a present. £2. [*Ready.*

BISHOP BUTLER'S ANALOGY of RELIGION; with Analytical Index. By EDWARD STEERE, LL.D. 12s.; or in antique calf for a present, £1. 1s. [*Ready.*

HERBERT'S POEMS and REMAINS; with S. T. COLERIDGE'S Notes, and Life, by IZAAK WALTON. Revised, with additional Notes, by Mr. J. YEOWELL. [*In the Press.*

SPENSER'S COMPLETE WORKS; with Life, Notes, and Glossary, by JOHN PAYNE COLLIER, Esq., F.S.A. [*In the Press.*

MILTON'S COMPLETE WORKS; with Notes by the Rev. J. E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; and a Memoir. [*In Preparation.*

In 2 vols. 4to. cloth, £4. 14s. 6d.; half-russia, £5. 15s. 6d.; russia, £6. 12s.

DR. RICHARDSON'S NEW DICTIONARY of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE, combining Explanation with Etymology, and copiously Illustrated by Quotations from the best Authorities. *New Edition*, with a Supplement containing Additional Words and further Illustrations.

*** The SUPPLEMENT, separately, 4to. cloth, price 12s.

Also, without the Quotations, 8vo. price 15s.

London: BELL and DALDY, 186 Fleet Street.

CHOICE NOTES

FROM

"NOTES AND QUERIES."

LONDON:
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

CHOICE NOTES

FROM

"NOTES AND QUERIES."

HISTORY.

By thee I might correct, erroneous oft,
The clock of History — facts and events
Timing more punctual, unrecorded facts
Recovering, and mis-stated setting right.
COWPER'S *Yardley Oak.*

LONDON:
BELL AND DALDY, 186 FLEET STREET.
1858.

LIBRARY
JAN
30
1981
OF

17985

PREFACE.

On the completion of the First Series of Notes and Queries, it was suggested from many quarters, that a selection of the more curious articles scattered through the twelve volumes would be welcome to a numerous body of readers. It was said that such a selection, judiciously made, would not only add to a class of books of which we have too few in English literature,—we mean books of the pleasant gossiping character of the French Ana for the amusement of the general reader,—but would serve in some measure to supply the place of the entire series to those who might not possess it.

It has been determined to carry out this idea by the publication of a few small volumes, each devoted to a particular subject. The first, which is here presented to the reading world, is devoted to History: and we trust that whether the reader looks at the value of the original documents here reprinted, or the historical truths here established, he will be disposed to address the book in the words of Cowper,

so happily suggested by Mr. Peter Cunningham as the appropriate motto of NOTES AND QUERIES itself,—

> By thee I might correct, erroneous oft,
> The clock of History—facts and events
> Timing more punctual, unrecorded facts
> Recovering, and mis-stated setting right.

While on the other hand the volume, from its miscellaneous character, will, we hope, be found an acceptable addition to that pleasant class of books which Horace Walpole felicitously describes as "lounging books, books which one takes up in the gout, low spirits, ennui, or when one is waiting for company."

THE EDITOR.

CHOICE NOTES

FROM

"NOTES AND QUERIES."

HISTORY.

MONMOUTH'S ASH.

In the first number of Notes and Queries there appeared a very interesting paper by Mr. Bruce on Macaulay's description of the capture of the Duke of Monmouth, with a query as to the precise locality at which the capture took place, which elicited the following reply from the late Earl of Shaftesbury: —

The whole of Woodlands now belongs to me. The greater part of it was bought by my late brother soon after he came of age.

I knew nothing of Monmouth Close till the year 1787, when I was shooting on Horton Heath; the gamekeeper advised me to try for game in the inclosures called Shag's Heath, and took me to see Monmouth Close and the famous ash tree there.

I then anxiously inquired of the inhabitants of the neighbouring houses respecting the traditions concerning Monmouth Close and the celebrated ash tree, and what I then learnt I have printed for the information of any person who may visit that spot.

What I have since learnt convinces me that the Duke was not going to Christchurch. He was on his way to Bournemouth, where he expected to find a vessel. Monmouth Close is in the direct line from Woodyates to Bournemouth.

About sixty years ago there was hardly a house there. It was the leading place of all the smugglers of this neighbourhood. SHAFTESBURY.

St. Giles's House, Nov. 27, 1849.

HISTORY OF MONMOUTH CLOSE.

The small inclosure which has been known by the name of Monmouth Close ever since the capture of the Duke of Monmouth there, in July, 1685, is one of a cluster of small inclosures, five in number, which stood in the middle of Shag's Heath, and were called "The Island." They are in the parish of Woodlands.

The tradition of the neighbourhood is this: viz. That after the defeat of the Duke of Monmouth at Sedgemoor, near Bridgewater, he rode, accompanied by Lord Grey, to Woodyates, where they quitted their horses; and the Duke having changed clothes with a peasant, endeavoured to make his way across the country to Christchurch. Being closely pursued, he made for the Island, and concealed himself in a ditch which was overgrown with fern and underwood. When his pursuers came up, an old woman gave information of his being in the Island, and of her having seen him filling his pocket with peas. The Island was immediately surrounded by soldiers, who passed the night there, and threatened to fire the neighbouring cotts. As they were going away, one of them espied the skirt of the Duke's coat, and seized him. The soldier no sooner knew him, than he burst into tears, and reproached himself for the unhappy discovery. The Duke when taken was quite exhausted with fatigue and hunger, having had no food since the battle but the peas which he had gathered in the field. The ash tree is still standing under which the Duke

was apprehended, and is marked with the initials of many of his friends who afterwards visited the spot.

The family of the woman who betrayed him were ever after holden in the greatest detestation, and are said to have fallen into decay, and to have never thriven afterwards. The house where she lived, which overlooked the spot, has since fallen down. It was with the greatest difficulty that any one could be made to inhabit it.

The Duke was carried before Anthony Etterick, Esq., of Holt, a justice of the peace, who ordered him to London.

His gold snuff-box was afterwards found in the pea-field, full of gold pieces, and brought to Mrs. Uvedaile, of Horton. One of the finders had fifteen pounds for half the contents or value of it.

Being asked what he would do if set at liberty, —the Duke answered, that if his horse and arms were restored. he only desired to ride through the army, and he defied them all to take him again.

LORD CHATHAM—QUEEN CHARLOTTE.

Original Letter, written on the Resignation of Mr. Pitt, in 1761—Public Feeling on the Subject, and Changes at Court in consequence — First Impressions of Queen Charlotte.

The following valuable original letter will be found to be of very considerable historical curiosity and interest. The resignation of the Great Commoner in 1761, and his acceptance at the same time of a pension and a peerage for his family, were events which astonished his admirers as much as any thing else in his wonderful career. Even now, after the recent publication of all the letters relating to these transactions, it is difficult to put any construction on Mr. Pitt's conduct which is consistent with the high-spirited independence which one desires to believe to have been a leading feature of his character. There may have been great subtlety in the way in which he was tempted; that may be admitted by the stoutest defenders of the character of George III.; but nothing can excuse the eager, rap-

turous gratitude with which the glittering bait was caught. The whole circumstances are related in the *Chatham Correspondence*, ii. 146., coupled with Adolphus's *Hist. of England.*

A kind judgment upon them may be read in Lord Mahon's *Hist. of England*, iv. 365., and one more severe—perhaps, more just—in Lord Brougham's *Historical Sketches*, in the article on Lord Chatham. See also the *Pictorial History of the Reign of George III.*, i. 13. After consulting all these authorities the reader will still find new facts, and a vivid picture of the public feeling, in the following letter.

Dear Robinson,—I am much obliged to you for both your letters, particularly the last, in which I look upon the freedom of your expostulations as the strongest mark of your friendship, and allow you to charge me with any thing that possibly can be brought against one upon such an occasion, except forgetfulness of you. I left town soon after receiving your first letter, and was moving about from place to place, till the coronation brought me to town again, and has fixed me here for the winter; however I do not urge my unsettled situation during the summer as any excuse for my silence, but aim to lay it upon downright indolence, which I was ashamed of before I received your second letter, and have been angry with myself for it since; however, as often as you'll do me the pleasure, and a very sincere one it is I assure you, of letting me hear how you do, you may depend upon the utmost punctuality for the future, and I undertake very seriously to answer every letter you shall write me within a fortnight.

The ensuing winter may possibly produce many things to amaze you; it has opened with one that I am sure will; I mean Mr. Pitt's resignation, who delivered up the seals to the King last Monday. The reason commonly given for this extraordinary step is a resolution taken in Council contrary to Mr. Pitt's opinion, concerning our conduct towards the Spaniards, who, upon the breaking off of the negotiations with France and our sending Mr. Bussy away, have,

it is said, made some declarations to our Court which Mr. Pitt was for having the King treat in a very different manner from that which the rest of the Cabinet advised, and they are said to have been all against Mr. Pitt's opinion, except Lord Temple. The effect of this resignation you'll easily imagine. It has opened all the mouths of all the news-presses in England, and, from our boasted unanimity and confidence in the Government, we seem to be falling apace into division and distrust; in the meantime Mr. Pitt seems to have entered, on this occasion, upon a new mode of resignation, at least for him, for he goes to Court, where he is much taken notice of by the King, and treated with great respect by every body else, and has said, according to common report, that he intends only to tell a plain story, which I suppose we are to have in the House of Commons. People, as you may imagine, are very impatient for his own account of a matter about which they know so little at present, and which puts public curiosity to the rack.

Fresh matter for patriots and politicians! Since writing the former part of this letter, I have been at the coffee-house, and bring you back verbatim a very curious article of the *Gazette*. "St. James's, Oct. 9. The Right Hon. William Pitt having resigned the Seals into the King's hands, his Majesty was this day pleased to appoint the Earl of Egremont to be one of his principal Secretaries of State, and in consideration of the great and important services of the said Mr. Pitt, his Majesty has been graciously pleased to direct that a warrant be prepared for granting to the Lady Hester Pitt, his wife, a Barony of Great Britain, by the name, style and title of Baroness of Chatham to herself, and of Baron of Chatham to her heirs male; and also to confer upon the said William Pitt, Esq. an annuity of 3000*l.* sterling during his own life, that of Lady Hester Pitt, and that of their son John Pitt, Esq.!"

A report of this matter got about the day before, and most unfortunately all the newspapers contradicted it as a scandalous report, set on foot with a design to tarnish the lustre of a certain great character. This was the style of

the morning and evening papers of Saturday, and of those who converse upon their authority; so that the coming in of the *Gazette* about ten o'clock at night, it was really diverting to see the effect it had upon most people's countenances at Dick's Coffee House, where I was; it occasioned a dead silence, and I think every body went away without giving their opinions of the matter, except Dr. Collier, who has always called Mr. Pitt all the rogues he can set his mouth on. It appears at present a most unaccountable proceeding in every part of it, for he seems to have forfeited his popularity, on which his consequence depended, for a consideration which he might have commanded at any time; and yet he does not make an absolute retreat, for in that case one should think he would have taken the peerage himself.

Lord Temple has resigned the Privy Seal, which is commonly said to be intended for Lord Hardwycke; some comfort to him for the loss of his wife, who died a few weeks ago. So that we seem to be left in the same hands out of which Mr. Pitt gloried in having delivered us; for, as you have probably heard before this time, Mr. Legge was removed from his place in the spring, for having refused to support any longer our German measures, as has been commonly said and not contradicted that I know of. Every body agrees that he was quite tired of his place, as is generally said on account of the coolness between him and Mr. Pitt, the old quarrel with the Duke of Newcastle, and some pique between him and Lord Bute on account of the Hampshire election. People were much diverted with the answer he is said to have made to the Duke of Newcastle when he went to demand the seal of his office. He compared his retirement to Elysium, and told the Duke he thought he might assure their common friends there, that they should not be long without the honour of his Grace's company; however, he seems to be out in his guess, for the Newcastle junto, strengthened by the Duke of Bedford, who has joined them, seems to be in all its glory again. This appeared in the Church promotions the other day, for

Dr. Young was translated, the master of Bennet made a bishop, and Mr. York dean: however, as you will probably be glad of a more particular account of our Church promotions, I am to tell you that the scene opened soon after the King's accession with the promotion of Dr. Squire to the Bishoprick of St. David's, upon the death of Ellis. Some circumstances of this affair inclined people to think that the old ecclesiastical shop was quite shut up; for the Duke of Newcastle expressed great dissatisfaction at Squire's promotion, and even desired Bishop Young to tell every body that he had no hand in it. Young answered, that he need not give himself that trouble, for Dr. Squire had told every body so already, which is generally said to be very true: for he did not content himself with saying how much he was obliged to Lord Bute, but seemed to be afraid lest it should be thought he was obliged to any body else. What an excellent courtier! The next vacancy was made by Hoadly, upon which Thomas was translated from Salisbury to Winchester, Drummond from St. Asaph to Salisbury, Newcome from Llandaff to St. Asaph, and that exemplary divine Dr. Ewer made Bishop of Llandaff. These were hardly settled when Sherlock and Gilbert dropt almost together. Drummond has left Salisbury for York, Thomas is translated from Lincoln to Salisbury, Green made Bishop of Lincoln, and succeeded in his deanery by Mr. York: Hayter is translated from Norwich to London, Young from Bristol to Norwich, and Newton is made Bishop of Bristol; and I must not forget to tell you, that, among several new chaplains, Beadon is one. This leads me naturally to Lord Bute, who, though the professed favourite of the King, has hitherto escaped the popular clamour pretty well; the immense fortune that is come into his family by the death of old Wortley Montague has added much to his consequence, and made him be looked upon as more of an Englishman: at least they can no longer call him a poor Scot.

His wife was created a peeress of Great Britain at the same time that Mr. Spencer, Mr. Doddington, Sir Richard

Grosvenor, Sir Nat. Curzen, Sir Thomas Robinson, and Sir William Irby were created peers. He has married his eldest daughter to Sir James Lowther, and is himself, from being Groom of the Stole, become Secretary of State—Lord Holderness being removed with very little ceremony indeed, but with a pension, to make room for him. He and Mr. Pitt together have made good courtiers of the Tories; Lords Oxford, Litchfield, and Bruce, being supernumerary lords, and Norbonne Berkeley, Northey, and I think George Pitt, supernumerary Grooms of the Bedchamber. Sir Francis Dashwood is Treasurer of the Chamber, in the room of Charles Townshend, who was made Secretary at War upon Lord Barrington's succeeding Mr. Legge as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Lord Talbot, who is in high favour, is Steward of the Household, and with his usual spirit has executed a scheme of economy, which, though much laughed at at first, is now much commended. They made room for him upon Lord Bute's being made Secretary, at which time Lord Huntingdon was made Groom of the Stole, and succeeded as Master of the Horse by the Duke of Rutland, who was before Steward of the Household. Thus have I concluded this series of removals, which was first begun, after the old King's death, by Lord Bute's being Groom of the Stole in the room of Lord Rochford, who has a pension, and Lord Huntingdon's being made Master of the Horse instead of Lord Gower, who was made Master of the Wardrobe in the room of Sir Thomas Robinson, who has his peerage for a recompense; and written you a long letter, which may perhaps be no better for you upon the whole than an old newspaper. However, I was determined your curiosity should be no sufferer by my long silence if I could help it.

I must not conclude without saying something of our new Queen. She seems to me to behave with equal propriety and civility, though the common people are quite exasperated at her not being handsome, and the people at Court laugh at her courtesies. All our friends are well, and have had nothing happen to them that I know of which requires

particular mention. Gisborne either has or will write to you very soon. Convince me, dear Robinson, by writing soon that you forgive my long silence, and believe me to be, with the sincerest regard for you and yours, your most affectionate friend, G. CRUCH.*

Mrs. Wilson's, Lancaster Court,
Oct^r. 12^th.

(Addressed)
To
The Ho^d Mr. Will^m Robinson
Recomende à Messieurs Tierney & Merry †
a Naples.
(Memorandum indorsed)
Ring just rec^d that of 22^d Sept.
16^th *Oct^r.* 1761.

WIFE OF ROBERT DE BRUCE.

The Rev. Lambert Larking writes,—In the Surrenden Collection is an interesting roll, entitled "Liberatio facta Ingelardo de Warlee Custodi Garderobe, 7 E. 2." It is, as its title imports, the release to the keeper of the wardrobe, for one year's accounts, a°. 7 E. 2.

I shall probably be able to send you therefrom a few "notes" illustrative of the history of that time.

As a commencement, I think that the subjoined "note" will interest your historical readers.

It appears that the unfortunate wife of Robert Bruce was then consigned to the care of the Abbess of Barking, with an allowance of 20*s.* per week for the same. She was, I believe, the daughter of Henry de Burgh, Earl of Ulster, and died in 1328. In the above roll there is the following entry:—

* The name is not easy to be made out; but, as far as it is determinable by comparison of hand-writing, it is "Cruch." The letter passed through the post-office.

† The part printed in *italics* was added by some other person than the writer of the letter.

"C^s liberati Anne de Veer Abbatisse de Berkyng, per manus domini Roberti de Wakfeld clerici, super expensis domine Elizabethe uxoris Roberti de Brus, percipientis per ebdomadum xx^s., et ibidem perhendinantis."

"C^s liberati Johanni de Stystede valletto Abbatisse de Berkyngg, per manus proprias, super expensis Domine de Brus in Abbathia de Berkyng perhendinantis."

It does not appear, in the above roll, how long the hapless queen remained in the abbey.

This communication led to the following from Mr. W. B. Rye:—

CAPTIVITY OF THE QUEEN OF BRUCE IN ENGLAND.

I perceive, in one of the recent interesting communications made to the "NOTES AND QUERIES," by the Rev. Lambert B. Larking, that he has given, from a wardrobe roll in the Surrenden collection, a couple of extracts, which show that Bruce's Queen was in 1314 in the custody of the Abbess of Barking. To that gentleman our thanks are due for the selection of documents which had escaped the careful researches of Lysons, and which at once throw light on the personal history of a royal captive, and illustrate the annals of a venerable Abbey. I am glad to be able to answer the concluding query as to the exact date when the unfortunate lady, (Bruce's second wife,) left that Abbey, and to furnish a few additional particulars relative to her eight years' imprisonment in England. History relates, that in less than three months after the crown had been placed upon the head of Bruce by the heroic Countess of Buchan, sister of the Earl of Fife (29th March, 1306), he was attacked and defeated at Methven, near Perth, by the English, under Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke. After this signal discomfiture, the king fled into the mountains, accompanied by a few faithful followers: his Queen, daughter, and several other ladies, for awhile shared his misfortunes and dangers; but they at length took refuge at the Castle of Kildrummie, from whence they retreated, in the hope of greater security, to the sanctuary of St. Duthac, at Tain, in Ross-shire. The Earl of Ross, it is said, violated

the sanctuary, and delivered the party up to the English, who (as sings Chaucer's contemporary, Barbour, in his not very *barbarous* Scottish dialect) straightway proceeded to

> —— "put the ladyis in presoune,
> Sum in till castell, sum in dongeoun."

Among the captives were three ecclesiastics, who had taken a prominent part at the king's coronation—the Bishops of Glasgow and St. Andrews, and the Abbot of Scone, arrayed in most uncanonical costume.* Peter Langtoft pathetically bewails their misfortune:—

> "The Bisshop of Saynt Andrew, and the Abbot of Scone,
> The Bisshop of Glascow, thise were taken sone:
> Fettred on hackneis, to Inlond ere thei sent,
> On sere stedis it seis, to prison mad present."

An instrument in Norman French, printed in Rymer's great collection (*Fœdera*, vol. i. part ii. p. 994, new ed.), directs the manner in which the prisoners were to be treated. As this document is curious, I will give that portion which refers particularly to Bruce's wife, the "Countess of Carrick:"—

"A. D. 1306. (34 Edw. 1.) Fait a remembrer, qi, quant la Femme le Conte de Carrik sera venue au Roi, ele soit envee a *Brustewik* [on Humber], & qe ele eit tieu mesnee, & sa sustenance ordenee en la manere desouz escrite: cest asavoir.

"Qe ele eit deux femmes du pays ovesqe li; cest asaver, une damoisele & une femme por sa chambre, qi soient bien d'age & nyent gayes, & qui eles soient de bon & meur port; les queles soient entendantz, a li por li servir:

"Et deux vadletz, qi soient ausint bien d'age, & avisez, de queux l'un soit un des vadletz le Conte de Ulvestier [the Earl of Ulster, her father], cest asaver Johan de Benteley, ou autre qil mettra en lieu de li, & l'autre acun du pays, qi soit por trencher devant li:

"Et ausant eit ele un garzon a pee, por demorer en sa chambre, tiel qi soit sobre, & ne mie riotous, por son lit faire, & por autres choses qe covendront por sa chambre:

"Et, estre ce, ordenez est qeele eit un Vadlet de mestier, que soit de bon port, & avisez, por port ses cleifs, por panetrie, & botellerie, & un cu:

* *Loricati* (in their coats of mail).—*Matthew of Westminster.*

"Et ele deit ausint aver trois leveriers, por aver son deduyt en la garrene illueques, & en les parcs, quant ele voudra:

"Et qe ele eit de la veneison, & du peisson es pescheries, selenc ce qe mester li sera:

"Et qe ele gisse en la plus bele maison du manoir a sa volunte: Et, qe ele voit guyer es parcs, r'aillois entor le manoir, a sa volunte."

These orders are apparently not more severe than was necessary for the safe custody of the Queen; and, considering the date of their issue, they seem to be lenient, considerate, and indulgent. Not so, however, with the unfortunate Countess of Buchan, who was condemned to be encaged in a turret of Berwick Castle ("en une *kage* de fort latiz, de fuist & barrez, & bien efforcez de ferrement;" *i. e.* of strong lattice-work of wood, barred, and well strengthened with iron*), where she remained immured seven years. Bruce's daughter, Marjory, and his sister Mary, were likewise to be encaged, the former in the Tower of London, the latter in Roxburghe Castle. The young Earl of Mar, "L'enfant qi est heir de Mar," Bruce's nephew, was to be sent to Bristol Castle, to be carefully guarded, "qil ne puisse eschaper en nule manere," but not to be *fettered*— "mais q'il soit hors de fers, *tant come il est de si tendre age.*"

In 1308 (1 Edw. 2.), the Bailiff of Brustwick is commanded to deliver up his prisoner, to be removed elsewhere, but to what place it does not appear. A writ of the 6th Feb. 1312, directs her to be conveyed to Windsor Castle, "cum familia sua." In October of the same year, she was removed to "Shaston" (Shaftesbury), and subsequently to the Abbey of Barking, where she remained till March, 1314, when she was sent to Rochester Castle, as appears by the following writ (Rymer, vol. ii. part i. p. 244.):—

"(7 Edw. 2.) *De ducendo Elizabetham uxorem Roberti de Brus usque ad Castrum Roffense.*

"Mandatum est Vicecomitibus London' quod Elizabetham, Uxorem

* See the order at length in Rymer, *ut sup.*

Roberti de Brus, quæ cum Abbattissâ de Berkyngg' stetit per aliquot tempus, de mandato Regis, ab eâdem Abbatissâ sine dilatione recipiant, eam usque Roff' duci sub salvâ custodia faciant, Henrico de Cobeham, Constabulario Castri Regis ibidem per Indenturam, indè faciendam inter ipsos, liberandam; et hoc nullatenus omittant.

"Teste Rege, apud Westm. xii. die Martii,
"Per ipsum Regem.

"Et mandatum est præfatæ Abbatissæ, quod præfatam Elizabetham, quam nuper, de mandato Regis, admisit in domo suâ de Berkyng' quousque Rex aliud inde ordinâsset, moraturam, sine dilatione deliberet præfatis Vicecomitibus, ducendam prout eis per Regem plenius est injunctum, et hoc nullatenus omittat.

"Teste Rege ut supra,
"Per ipsum Regem.

"Et mandatum est dicto Henrico, Constabulario Castri Regis prædicti, quod ipsam Elizabetham de prædictis Vicecomitibus, per Indenturam hujusmodi, recipiat, et ei cameram, infra dictum Castrum competentem pro morâ suâ assignari:

"Et viginti solidos, de exitibus Ballivæ suæ, ei per singulas septimanas, quamdiu ibidem moram fecerit, pro expensis suis, liberari faciat:

"Eamque, infra Castrum prædictum, et infra Prioratum Sancti Andreæ ibidem, opportunis temporibus spatiari sub salvâ custodiâ (ita quod securus sit de corpore suo), permittat:

"Et Rex ei de prædictis viginti solidis, præfatæ Elizabethæ singulis septimanis liberandis, debitam allocationem, in compoto suo ad Scaccarium Regis, fieri faciet.

"Teste ut supra,
"Per ipsum Regem."

But the day of deliverance was close at hand: the battle of Bannockburn, so fatal to the English, was fought on the 24th June; and on the 2nd of October the Constable of Rochester Castle is commanded to conduct the wife, sister, and daughter of Robert Bruce to Carlisle (*usque Karliolum*), where an exchange of prisoners was made. Old Hector Boece, who, if Erasmus can be trusted, "knew not to lie," informs us, that "King Robertis wife, quhilk was hald in viii. yeris afore in Ingland, wes interchangeit with ane duk of Ingland"* [Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford].

* Bellenden's translation.

And the aforesaid Barbour celebrates their restoration in the following lines : —

"Quhill at the last they tretyt sua,
That he * till Inglond hame suld ga,
For owtyn paying of ransoune, fre;
And that for him suld changyt be
Byschap Robert † that blynd was mad;
And the Queyne, that thai takyn had
In presoune, as before said I;
And hyr douchtre dame Marjory.
The Erle was changyt for thir thre."

A COTEMPORARY ACCOUNT OF THE "BATTLE OF KERBESTER," IN ROSS, 27TH APRIL, 1650.

Lieut. General Lesly having appointed a rendevouz of his forces at Brechin, 25 Aprile, did make all possible haste against the enemie, marching 30 miles everie day, and to put a stop to the enemies' advance, he sent Lieut. Col. Strachan before him to command the troopes that were lying about Rosse and Innernesse.

Upon Saterday, the 27 Aprile, y^e^ enemie was quartered at Strathekell in Rosse ; L. Colonell Strachan with his owne troope, Colonell Montgomery, Colonell Ker's, L. Colonell Hackett's, and the Irishe troopes were quartered about Kincardine ; the number y^at^ wer present being onlie about 230 : the officers being conveined, and having considered the grate scarsity of provisions for horsse, and y^at^ it was very probable, y^e^ enemies' strength being in foote, they would take the hills upon the advance of more of our horsses, they concludit to fight y^at^ wicked crewe with the force they had. Bot the Lord's day approaching, and the enemie being 10 miles distant, they doubted whither to marche towardes them presentlie, or to delay untill Monday, and so declyne y^e^ hazard of ingageing upone y^e^ Lord's day ; bot this doubt was soune removed, for notice was

* The Earl of Hereford.

† Wisheart, Bishop of Gloucester, before alluded to.

presentlie brought, that the enemy was marched from Strathekel to Corbisdale, sex miles nearer unto them, wheripone they furthwith drew upe in 3 pairties—the 1, consisting of neire a 100 horsse, to be led one by L. Colonell Straquhan; y^e^ 2, somme more than 80, to be led one by L. Colonell Hackett; and y^e^ 3, about 40, to be led one by Captaine Hutchesone; and 36 musquetaires of Lawer's regiment (which wer occasionally upon the place), to be led one by Quarter Master Shaw: after prayers said by the minister, they marched, about 3 o' clock in the after noone, towards the enemy, quho were drawin upe in a plaine, neire a hill of scrogie woode, to which upon the advance of our horsse they quicklie retired. Yet L. Colonell Strachan pursued them into the woode, and at y^e^ first charge made them all to rune; the Lord did stricke such a terror into their hartes, as ther most resolute Commanders had not y^e^ courage to lifte a hand to defend themselves; and our forces without opposition did executione one them for 5 or 6 myles, even untill sunne sett.

Ther wer killed 10 of their best Commanders, most of their officers takin, and 386 comon souldiers. The number of the quhole (as y^e^ prisoners did informe) was not above 1200, of all wich ther did not escape one 200, bot wer ather takin prisoners, killed, or drawned in a river y^at^ was neir y^e^ place; ye cheiffe standard called y^e^ kinges, and four others, were takin; y^e^ *Traitor James Grhame* escapit, bot was afterwards takin by the Laird of Assin's people. His horse was takin; his coate with y^e^ starre, and sword belt, wer found on the field. L. Col. Strachan received a shotte upon his belley, but lighting upon the double of his belte and buffe coate, did not peirce.

One of our troopers haisting too forwardly after a boate, wich carried 2 or 3 of the enemie over the river, was drowned, and 2 were woundit, and this was all y^e^ losse Straquhan and his fellowes had.

It is to be remembered y^at^ Cap. Will. Rosse and Cap. Johne Rosse came upe to the executione with 80 fellowes chosen out of y^e^ country forces, and did good service.

A Liste of those who were killed at y Battle of Kerbester in Rosse, 27 Aprile, 1650.

Laird of Pourie Ogilvy.
Laird of Pitfodells, younger, Standard Bearer.
Jo. Douglasse, youngest sonne to Will. Earl of Morton.
Major Lyle.
Major Byger.
Capitan Stirling.
Captane Powell.

A Liste of the Officers takin.

Vicount Frendraught.
G. Major Urrie.
Col. Graye.
L. Col. Stewart.
Major Stockes.
Cap. Mortimer.
Routte Master Vellemneson.
Peter Squer, Cap. of Dragoons.
Cap. Warden.
Cap. Authenlecke.
Cap. Spotswoode.
Cap. Charteris.
Cap. Lawsone.
Leutt. Carstaires.
Leut. Vertrun.
L. Androw Glen.
L. Rob. Tenche.
Ernestus Buchan.
Laurence Van Lutenberge.
L. Da Druñond.
L. Will. Rosse.
L. Jo. Druñond.
L. Ja. Din.
L. Alex. Stewart.
Cornett Ralph Martie.
Cor. Hen. Erlachie.
Cor. Daniell Bennichie.
Ens. Rob. Grahame.
Ens. Adrian Rigwerthe.
Ens. Hans Boaze.
2 Quartermasters, 6 Serjeants, 15 Corporalls, 2 Trumpetters, 3 Drummers, 386 Soũldiers, and 2 Ministers, Mr. Kiddie, Mr. Meldrum.

The above quaint but graphic account of one of the battles of the olden times — the "last fight," too, of the celebrated and gallant Marquess of Montrose — is a literal copy of a MS. in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh (W. 7. 6.), supposed to have belonged to Sir James Balfour of Denmill, Lord Lyon King-at-Arms, temp. Charles I. and Charles II. It is evidently a cotemporary account.

The scene of the battle is very correctly described. The spot is situated in the parish of Kincardine, Ross-shire, N.B. The plain is bounded on one side by a river of considerable width and depth, the Oikel (hence "Strathekell," or Strath Oikel), and on the other by a range of low hills, still covered with a "scrogie woode." Skulls, pieces of

broken armour, and weapons of war, have occasionally been dug up in the field of battle; but no tradition appears to linger about the spot among the surrounding peasantry, which is rather strange.

It is easy to see, from the above account of this battle, that it was written by an enemy of Montrose, and adherent of the covenanting party; but still the facts are probably correct.

Mr. Napier, in his *Life and Times of Montrose*, p. 469. edit. 1840, as well as in his *Montrose and the Covenanters*, vol. ii. p. 530. edit. 1838, has given a vivid description of the battle of Corbisdale, which substantially agrees with the above account.

LETTER FROM CHARLES I. TO CHIEF JUSTICE HEATH.

The following extract from the papers of Sir Robert Heath, the last Chief Justice of England during the reign of Charles I., which refers to the circuits of the judges in that reign, was communicated by Mr. Evelyn P. Shirley:

"CHARLES R.

"Trusty and welbeloved, wee greet you well. Out of our desire that justice should be duely administred in all the parts of this o^r^ kingdome to all o^r^ loving subjects, according to our knowne lawes, and according to the auncient coarse w^ch^ hath been held for our judges to ryde their circuits twice in the yeare, wee gaue speciall directions that you should hold yo^r^ summer assizes in the seuerall counties to w^ch^ you are assigned, and wee were then hopefull that the distraccõns of the tymes would not haue been any impediment unto you to performe that service.

"But seeing wee are now informed that this cannot be done in many and in most places of this realme without much inconuenience to yo^r^selves and those who should attend you, or haue busines before you, wee are well pleased to referre it wholly to yo^r^ good discrecõns to forbeare those places whither yo^r^selues conceaue you may not goe with conuenient safety, and our subjects who shall want the benefitt of yo^r^ labors must excuse both us and you, and expect and pray for

better tymes. Given under o^r signet at o^r C^rt at Oxford, the fourth day of July in the nineteenth yeare of o^r raigne. [1643.]

"To our trusty and welbeloved S^r Robert Heath, K^t, Cheife Justice of our Bench, and Justice of Assize for o^r Counties of Berks, Oxon., Gloucester, Monmouth, Hereford, Wygorn, Salop, and Stafford."

GREAT FIRE OF LONDON.

Our popular histories of England, generally, contain very indefinite statements respecting the extent of destruction wrought upon the city of London by the Great Fire. The following is copied from a volume of tracts, printed 1679 to 1681; chiefly "Narratives" of judicial and other proceedings relating to the (so called) "Popish Plots" in the reign of Charles II., and purports to be "extracted from the Certificates of the Surveyors soon after appointed to survey the Ruins."

"That the fire that began in London upon the second of September, 1666, at one Mr. Farryner's house, a baker in Pudding Lane, between the hours of one and two in the morning, and continued burning until the sixth of that month, did overrun the space of three hundred and seventy-three acres within the walls of the city of London, and sixty-three acres three roods without the walls. There remained seventy-five acres three roods standing within the walls unburnt. Eighty-nine parish churches, besides chappels burnt. Eleven parishes within the walls standing. Houses burnt, Thirteen thousand two hundred.

"JONAS MOORE,
"RALPH GATRIX, } Surveyors."

PERKIN WARBECK.

In the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Select Committee on the British Museum, in May, 1836, p. 308., mention is made of "a paper giving an account of the landing of Perkin Warbeck, signed by Sir Henry Wentworth, and dated 16th [17th] Sept. 1497," as of historical value. This "paper" was at that time in the possession of the late Mr. Upcott; and when I drew up for the Society of Antiquaries the article on "Perkin Warbeck's History," printed

in the *Archæologia*, vol. xxvii. pp. 153—210., I had no opportunity of seeing it, and therefore merely made a brief reference to it in a foot-note. The document subsequently passed, together with a large and valuable portion of Upcott's collection, into the hands of M. Donnadieu, and at the recent sale of that gentleman's collection of autographs was purchased for the British Museum. It is a letter from Sir Harry Wentworth of Nettlested, co. Suffolk (ancestor of the Barons Wentworth), addressed to Sir William Calverley, of Calverley in Yorkshire, from whom descended the extinct baronets of that name. The letter is not of great historical importance, yet, as furnishing some notices of the measures taken by the king, on learning that Perkin had landed in Cornwall, on the 7th of September (only ten days previous), it will not be read without interest. The letter is written on a strip of paper measuring eleven inches by four inches, and is signed only by Sir Harry Wentworth.

"Right wourshipfulle cosin, I recommend me vnto you. And where * it fortuned me in my retourne home from Westchestre, to meit my lord Darby, my lord Strange, and other at Whalley abbey, by whome I had the sight of suche lettres as were directed vnto theme frome the kinges grace; apperceyuing by the same that Perkin Warbeke is londid in the west parties, in Cornevelle, wherfore I wolle pray you, and allso in the kinges name aduertise you, to be in aredynes † in your owin persone, with suche company as you make, to serue his highnes, vpon an our ‡ warnyng, when his grace shalle calle vpone you. For the which I doubte not but his highnes shalle geve you thankes accordinge. As our lord knoith, who preserue you! Wretin in the kinges castelle of Knaresburght, the xvij dey of Septembre.

your [frend] and cosyne, syr
Harry Wentworth.

Addressed
To his wourshipfulle cosin syr William
Calverley, knight, in haste."

The Lord Strange mentioned in the above letter was the third son of the Earl of Derby, and died at Derby House, London, on the 5th Dec. 1497, less than three months after the letter was written. F. Madden.

* Whereas. † readiness. ‡ hour's.

CONFESSOR TO THE ROYAL HOUSEHOLD.

D'Israeli, in his *Commentaries on Life and Reign of Charles I.*, describing the difficulties which Elizabeth and James had to contend with in relation to their Catholic subjects, says:

"So obscure, so cautious, and so undetermined were the first steps to withdraw from the ancient Papistical customs, that Elizabeth would not forgive a bishop for marrying; and auricular confession, however condemned as a point of Popery, was still adhered to by many. Bishop Andrews would loiter in the aisles of St. Paul's to afford his spiritual comfort to the unburtheners of their conscience."

And he then adds this note:

"This last remains of Popery may still be traced among us; for, since the days of our Eighth Henry, the place of confessor to the royal household has never been abolished."

The office is connected with the Chapel Royal, St. James's, and is at present held by Dr. Charles Wesley, who is also sub-dean. The appointment is by the Dean of the Chapel Royal, the Bishop of London. The confessor (sometimes called chaplain) officiates at the early morning prayers, so punctually attended by the late Duke of Wellington. Chamberlayne, in the *Magnæ Britanniæ Notitia*, p. 97., edit. 1755, has the following notice of the Chapel Royal: "For the ecclesiastical government of the King's court, there is first a dean of the Chapel Royal, who is usually some grave, learned prelate, chosen by the King, and who, as dean, acknowledgeth no superior but the King; for as the King's palace is exempt from all inferior temporal jurisdiction, so is his chapel from all spiritual. It is called *Capella Dominica*, the domain chapel; is not within the jurisdiction or diocese of any bishop; but, as a regal peculiar, exempt and reserved to the visitation and immediate government of the King, who is supreme ordinary, as it were, over all England. By the dean are chosen all other officers of the chapel, namely, a sub-dean, or *præcentor capellæ*, thirty-two gentlemen of the chapel, whereof twelve are priests, and one of them is *confessor to the King's household*, whose office is to read

prayers every morning to the family, to visit the sick, to examine and prepare communicants, to inform such as desire advice in any case of conscience or point of religion," &c.

AUTOGRAPH OF EDWARD OF LANCASTER, SON OF HENRY VI.

In the Museum of Antiquities at Rouen is preserved an original document, thus designated, "Lettre d'Edouard, Prince de Galles (1471)." It is kept under a glass case, and shown as an "undoubted autograph of the Black Prince." It is as follows:

"Chers et bons amis, nous avons entendu, que ung nostre homme lige subject, natif de nostre pays de Galles, est occupé et détenu es prisons de la ville de Diepe, pour la mort d'un homme d'icelle ville, dont pour le dict cas autres ont esté exécutez. Et pour ce que nostre dict subject estoit clerc, a esté et est encores en suspens, parce qu'il a esté requis par les officiers de nostre très cher et aimé cousin l'archevesque de Rouen, afin qu'il leur fut rendu, ainsi que de droict; pourquoy nous vous prions, que icelui nostre homme et subject vous veuillez bailler et delivrer aux gens et officiers de mon dict cousin, sans en ce faire difficulté. Et nous vous en saurons un très grant gré, et nous ferez ung essingulier plaisir. Car monseigneur le roy de France nous a autorisez faire grace en semblable cas que celui de mon dict subject, duquel desirons fort la delivrance. Escript à Rouen, le onziesme jour de Janvier.

(Signed) EDUARD.
(Countersigned) MARTIN."

The error of assigning this signature to Edward the Black Prince is sufficiently obvious, and somewhat surprising, since we here have an undoubted, and, we believe, *unique* autograph of Edward of Lancaster, Prince of Wales, only son of Henry VI. by Margaret of Anjou. He was born at Westminster, October 13th, 1453, and was therefore, in January, 1471 (no doubt the true date of the docu-

ment), in the eighteenth year of his age. He had sought refuge from the Yorkists, in France, with his mother, ever since the year 1462, and in the preceding July or August, 1470, had been affianced to Anne Neville, the youngest daughter of the Earl of Warwick. At the period when this letter was written at Rouen, Margaret of Anjou was meditating the descent into England which proved so fatal to herself and son, whose life was taken away with such barbarity on the field at Tewksbury, in the month of May following. The letter is addressed, apparently, to the magistrates of Rouen or Dieppe, to request the liberation of a native of Wales (imprisoned for the crime of having slain a man), and his delivery to the officers of the Archbishop of Rouen, on the plea of his being a clerk. The prince adds, that he was authorised by the King of France (Louis XI.) to grant grace in similar cases. As the signature of this unfortunate prince is at present quite unknown in the series of English royal autographs, it would be very desirable that an accurate fac-simile should be made of it by some competent artist; and perhaps the art of photography might in this instance be most advantageously and successfully used to obtain a perfect copy of the entire document. F. Madden.

THE SISTER OF GEORGE III.

The following interesting cutting is from *The Times* of January 27, 1852:

"*The Sister of George III.*—The official journal of Copenhagen of the 17th instant gives an interesting document, hitherto unpublished, the original of which is in the secret archives of the State of Copenhagen. It is the letter which Queen Caroline Matilda, wife of Christian VII., King of Denmark, wrote during her exile, and on the day of her death, to her brother, George III. of England. The letter is as follows:

"'Sire,—In the solemn hour of death I address myself to you, my royal brother, in order to manifest to you my feelings of gratitude for the kindness you have shown me during my life, and particularly during my long misfortunes. I die willingly, for there is nothing to

bind me to this world — neither my youth (she was then in her twenty-third year) nor the enjoyments which might sooner or later be my portion. Besides, can life have any charms for a woman who is removed from all those whom she loves and cherishes — her husband, her children, her brothers and sisters? I, who am a queen, and the issue of a royal race, I have led the most wretched life, and I furnish to the world a fresh example that a crown and a sceptre cannot protect those who wear them from the greatest misfortunes. I declare that I am innocent, and this declaration I write with a trembling hand, bathed with the cold sweat of death. I am innocent. The God whom I invoke, who created me, and who will soon judge me, is a witness of my innocence. I humbly implore Him that He will, after my death, convince the world that I have never merited any of the terrible accusations by which my cowardly enemies have sought to blacken my character, tarnish my reputation, and trample under foot my royal dignity. Sire, believe your dying sister, a queen, and, what is still more, a Christian, who with fear and horror would turn her eyes towards the next world if her last confession were a falsehood. Be assured I die with pleasure, for the wretched regard death as a blessing. But what is more painful to me even than the agonies of death, is that none of the persons whom I love are near my death-bed to give me a last adieu, to console me by a look of compassion, and to close my eyes. Nevertheless, I am not alone. God, the only witness of my innocence, sees me at this moment, when, lying on my solitary couch, I am a prey to the most excruciating agonies. My guardian angel watches over me: he will soon conduct me where I may in quiet pray for my well-beloved, and even for my executioner. Adieu, my royal brother; may Heaven load you with its blessings, as well as my husband, my children, England, Denmark, and the whole world! I supplicate you to allow my body to be laid in the tomb of my ancestors; and now receive the last adieu of your unfortunate sister. CAROLINE MATILDA.

"'Celle (Hanover), May 10, 1775.'"

BIRTHPLACE OF THE EMPRESS JOSEPHINE.

It is commonly believed that the Island of Martinique was the birthplace of Marie Josephine Rose Tascher de la Pagerie, better known as the Empress Josephine. It would seem, however, from the following circumstances, that St. Lucia has a preferable claim to that distinction. By the treaty of Paris (10th February, 1763), St. Lucia, until then one of the neutral islands, was ceded to France, and

was made a dependency of Martinique. The first step adopted by the local authorities on that occasion, was to offer extensive grants of land in St. Lucia to such families in Martinique as might be disposed to settle in the former island; and among those who took advantage of the proposal was M. de Tascher, the father of Josephine. In the course of the year 1763 he came over to St. Lucia, and settled with his family on the crest of a hill called *Paix-Bouche*, within a few miles of the site now occupied by the principal town. Here they continued to reside until 1771, when M. de Tascher, having been selected for the office of President of the *Conseil Souverain* in Martinique, returned with his family to that island, taking with him a child seven years old, to whom Madame de Tascher had given birth at *Morne Paix-Bouche* on the 24th June, 1764, and who was destined to become the wife of Bonaparte and the Empress of France.

The fact that M. de Tascher and his family settled in St. Lucia after the Treaty of Paris, is too well established to require corroboration. The fact that his residence there extended from 1763 to 1771 is no less certain. While collecting materials some years ago for the history of St. Lucia, I met with the most authentic proofs of this circumstance; but having returned the books and documents to the several parties to whom they belonged, I am unable at this moment to give a special reference under this head. As regards the particular date of Mademoiselle De Tascher's birth, I am indebted for a knowledge of it to no less an authority than M. Sidney Daney, the author of a voluminous history of Martinique, who, while asserting that she was born on the paternal estate in that island, records the date in the following words:

"Cette année 1764 fut signalée par la naissance d'une femme qui, tout en parvenant à la plus glorieuse des destinées humaines, devait être à la fois le symbole le plus doux de cette divine charité. Le vingt-quatre Juin naquit aux Trois-Ilets, sur l'habitation de ses parens, Marie Josephine Rose Tascher de la Pagerie."

That the claim of St. Lucia to the honour of having given

birth to that remarkable woman is no idle dream, no imaginary pretension, now set up for the first time, can be shown by many circumstances. From her coronation in 1804, to her death in 1814, there were several persons in St. Lucia who asserted their knowledge of the fact. Some of them were still living in 1825, when the late Sir John Jeremie came to St. Lucia and collected information on the subject. In 1831 that able judge published in a local newspaper a short historical notice of St. Lucia, in which he gives the following unequivocal testimony on this question. I quote from the *St. Lucia Gazette and Public Advertiser* of 23rd February, 1831:

"On the summit of one of its (St. Lucia's) highest mountains, the *Paix-Bouche* (a word which in Negro-French is significantly expressive of silence), on a spot surrounded by trees, apparently the growth of centuries, it might be supposed that here at least the very name of the extraordinary being who has given an impulse to the age of Napoleon had scarcely reached. A few yards from the almost impracticable and faintly traced path is the mouldering foundation of a decayed cottage. *That was the birthplace of Josephine.* The inhabitants of Martinique, with whom all the St. Lucia families are connected, lay claim to Josephine as their countrywoman. The fact is, however, as I have stated it; and this was admitted by one of her own family at Martinique to a lady of our island, but with the truly French addition, 'qu'elle n'avait fait qu'y naître.' The companion of her childhood was Mr. Martin Raphael, late a councillor of the royal court, who is still living, and who on visiting France was kindly received by her at Malmaison. Madame Delomel, who died but a few months ago at a very advanced age, knew her well."

On my arrival in St. Lucia in 1831, an old woman of colour, named *Dédé*, was pointed out to me as having been in the service of the Taschers at *Morne Paix-Bouche*. She was then residing with the family of Mr. R. Juge, the President of the Court of First Instance, and that gentleman assured me that nothing was more certain than that Josephine was born in St. Lucia. I afterwards had several conversations with *Dédé* on the subject, and she confirmed Mr. Juge's statement, adding that she was present at the time of Josephine's birth, and was employed as her *bonne* until the departure of the family for Martinique. *Dédé* was an

intelligent old dame, then about eighty years of age, and was greatly respected by every one.

I am aware that all this is at variance with the biographical records of our time, which assign Martinique as the place of Josephine's birth. But this inaccuracy may be accounted for on the following grounds. 1st. St. Lucia is within a short distance of Martinique, and at the period of Josephine's birth was a dependency, a portion, as it were, of that colony. 2nd. The family had long been settled in Martinique before they came to St. Lucia, and all their predilections were for the former island. 3rd. Their sojourn in St. Lucia was not of long duration, and in a few years the circumstance of their having been there at all was probably forgotten by the public. 4th. There was no priest in St. Lucia in 1764, by whom the child might have been christened, and the place of her birth established beyond dispute. 5th. When at a subsequent period she was baptized in Martinique, it happened naturally enough that there was no one present who had any knowledge of her having been born in St. Lucia, or who felt any concern in the matter. 6th. M. De Tascher had now become a personage of some distinction, and he was probably not unwilling to efface the recollection of his having been, at one time, a needy planter in the wilds of St. Lucia. 7th. Facts which have since acquired an obvious importance were of none at all in 1771. The suppression of such a circumstance, whether intentional or accidental, would have attracted no notice at that period of the history of the Taschers. It was not then anticipated that a member of the family would, at no very remote period, become associated with the greatest actor in the most extraordinary revolution in the world's history, and prove herself not unworthy of so exalted a destiny.

All that relates to the Empress Josephine receives an added degree of interest from recent occurrences. It would be strange if the wife who was discarded by Napoleon because she could not give him an heir for the imperial throne, should give him, if not an heir, his first

successor, in the person of her grandson, Prince Louis Napoleon. As regards St. Lucia, too, there is a coincidence which may be worth mentioning. When Napoleon fell into our hands after the battle of Waterloo, St. Lucia was the place *first* selected for his exile; but in consequence of the dangers likely to arise from its proximity to Martinique, the scheme was relinquished, and the preference given to St. Helena. HENRY H. BREEN.

St. Lucia.

KING OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT.

Henry Beauchamp, Duke of Warwick, son of Richard Earl of Warwick, was crowned King of the Isle of Wight by patent 24 Henry VI., King Henry in person assisting at the ceremonial, and placing the crown on his head. Leland (*Itiner.*, vol. vi. p. 91.) says, "Henricus Comes de Warwike ab Henrico VI. cui carissimus erat, coronatus *in regem de Wighte*, et postea nominatus primus comes totius Angliæ." Leland takes this *ex Libello de Antiquitate Theoksibriensis Monasterii*, in the church of which house this Duke of Warwick was buried. But little notice has been taken of this singular event by our historians, and, except for some other collateral evidence, the authenticity of it might be doubted; but the representation of this duke with an imperial crown on his head and a sceptre before him, in an ancient window of the collegiate church at Warwick, leaves no doubt that such an event did take place. (See Worsley's *Hist. of the Isle of Wight* for a plate copied from an accurate drawing of the king.) This honourable mark of the royal favour, however, conveyed no regal authority, the king having no power to transfer the sovereignty of any part of his dominions, as is observed by Lord Coke in his *Institutes*, where this transaction is discussed; and there is reason to conclude that, though titular king, he did not even possess the lordship of the island, no surrender appearing from Duke Humphrey, who was then living, and had a grant for the term of his life. Mr. Selden too, in his *Titles*

of Honour, p. 29., treating of the title of the King of Man, observes that "it was like that of King of the Isle of Wight, in the great Beauchamp, Duke of Warwick, who was crowned king under Henry VI." Henry Beauchamp was also crowned King of Guernsey and Jersey. He died soon after these honours had been conferred on him, June 11, 1445, when the regal title expired with him, and the lordship of the island, at the death of the Duke of Gloucester, reverted to the crown.

BAPTISM, MARRIAGE, AND CROWNING OF GEO. III.

"Died at his palace at Lambeth, aged seventy-five, the Most Reverend Thomas Secker, LL.D., Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. His Grace was many years Prebendary of Durham, seventeen years Rector of St. James', Westminster, consecrated Bishop of Bristol in 1734, and in 1737 was translated to the See of Oxford. In 1750 he resigned the Rectory of St. James, on his succeeding Bishop Butler in the Deanery of St. Paul's; and on the death of Archbishop Hutton in 1758, was immediately nominated to the metropolitan see, and confirmed at Bow Church, on the 20th of April in that year, Archbishop of Canterbury. His Grace was Rector of St. James's when our present sovereign was born at Norfolk House, and had the honour to baptize, to marry, and crown his majesty and his royal consort, and to baptize several of their majesties' children."—*Pennsylvania Chronicle*, Oct. 3, 1768.

EXECUTION OF THE DUKE OF MONMOUTH.

The following anecdote is introduced, in the form of a note, into the folio Dictionary of Pierre Richelet, a most valuable work, and full of history, ancient and modern:—"Le Duc de Monmout donna six guinées au Bourreau de Londres, pour lui bien couper la tête; mais le misérable ne méritoit pas ces guinées, puisqu'il la lui coupa très mal." Richelet himself does not give any authority, but merely relates the story, apparently with a view of illustrating the

term "guinea," as applied to the gold coin of Charles the Second. Vid. voc. "*Guinée.*"

THE DUKE OF MONMOUTH AND THE ELECTORS OF HULL.

The following is a copy of a letter addressed to the Corporation of Hull: —

"Whitehall, 23 Aug.

"Gentlemen,

"Upon my arrivall att London I mett with the report of Mr. Marvell's death, one of the burgesses for yo^r^ towne, which gives me occasion to become a suitor to you in behalfe of Mr. Shales, that you would elect him to supply that vacancy in Parliament, whom I look upon as a person very well qualifyed to serve the king, his country, and yo^r^ Corporation in particular, to whose interests I shall always have a peculiar regard, and shall owne your kindness herein as an obligation to,

"Gentlemen,

"Y^r^ very humble Ser^vt^,

"Monmouth."

In another hand —

"Rec^d^ the 29^th^ Aug^t^, '78."

It appears, however, that the duke's friend, Mr. Shales, was not elected to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of Andrew Marvel, but apparently Mr. Anthony Gilby.

HAMPDEN'S DEATH.

A Query in the 8th vol. p. 495., as to whether the great patriot Hampden was actually slain by the enemy on Chalgrove Field? or whether his death was, as some have asserted, caused by the bursting of his own pistol, owing to its having been incautiously overcharged? produced the following communications: —

HAMPDEN'S DEATH.

"On the 21st of July, 1828, the corpse of John Hampden was disinterred by the late Lord Nugent for the purpose of settling the disputed point of history as to the manner in which the patriot received his death-wound. The examination seems to have been conducted

after a somewhat bungling fashion for a scientific object, and the facts disclosed were these : 'On lifting up the right arm we found that it was dispossessed of its hand. We might therefore naturally conjecture that it had been amputated, as the bone presented a perfectly flat appearance, as if sawn off by some sharp instrument. On searching under the cloths, to our no small astonishment we found the hand, or rather a number of small bones, inclosed in a separate cloth. For about six inches up the arm the flesh had wasted away, being evidently smaller than the lower part of the left arm, to which the hand was very firmly united, and which presented no symptoms of decay further than the two bones of the forefinger loose. Even the nails remained entire, of which we saw no appearance in the cloth containing the remains of the right hand. . . . . The clavicle of the right shoulder was firmly united to the scapula, nor did there appear any contusion or indentation that evinced symptoms of any wound ever having been inflicted. The left shoulder, on the contrary, was smaller and sunken in, as if the clavicle had been displaced. To remove all doubts, it was adjudged necessary to remove the arms, which were amputated with a penknife (!). The socket of the left (*sic*) arm was perfectly white and healthy, and the clavicle firmly united to the scapula, nor was there the least appearance of contusion or wound. The socket of the right (*sic*) shoulder, on the contrary, was of a brownish cast, and the clavicle being found quite loose and disunited from the scapula, proved that dislocation had taken place. The bones, however, were quite perfect.' These appearances indicated that injuries had been received both in the hand and shoulder, the former justifying the belief in Sir Robert Pye's statement to the Harleys, that the pistol which had been presented to him by Sir Robert, his son-in-law, had burst and shattered his hand in a terrible manner at the action of Chalgrove Field ; the latter indicating that he had either been wounded in the shoulder by a spent ball, or had received an injury there by falling from his horse after his hand was shattered. Of these wounds he died three or four days after, according to Sir Philip Warwick. According to Clarendon, 'three weeks after being shot into the shoulder with a brace of bullets, which broke the bone.' The bone, however, was not found broken, and the 'brace of bullets' is equally imaginary."

This account is from a newspaper cutting of *The News*, August 3, 1828.—(viii. 647.)

An account of the patriot's death, as related by Robert, Earl of Essex, said to have been given by an eye-witness, is extracted from the *Town and Country Magazine* for 1817, p. 27. :

"'You know,' said Sir Robert Pye (Hampden's son-in-law), 'it is commonly thought my father-in-law died by a wound he received at Chalgrove Field from the enemy, but you shall hear the exact truth of the matter, as I had it from my father himself, some time before he expired.'"

The account then describes the manner in which Hampden loaded his pistols, and concludes with stating, —

"That on examining Hampden's unloaded pistol, it was found charged up to the top by the attendant whose duty it was to load the same. And the other pistol being in the like state, occasioned its bursting, and wounding Hampden's arm in such a shocking manner, that he received his death-wound thereby, and not by any hurt from the enemy."

Echard the historian fully confirms this statement (see his *History of England*, quoted in Noble's *Cromwell*, vol. ii. p. 98.), asserting that he had been informed on the *best authority*, that Hampden's death, which took place some days after he was wounded, arose from the bursting of a pistol, which belonged to a case of pistols presented to him by Sir Robert Pye, his son-in-law, adding, that when Sir Robert visited Hampden in his last illness, he exclaimed, "Ah! Robin, your unhappy pistol has been my ruin." In confirmation of these statements was found a book from Lord Oxford's collection, communicated to the editor of *Anecdotes of Distinguished Persons* (vol. i. p. 396.), by the late H. J. Pye, Esq., Poet Laureate, who was lineally descended from Hampden in the female line, containing the account which follows:

"Two of the Harleys, and one of the Foleys, being at supper with Sir Robert Pye, at Farringdon House, Berks, on their way into Herefordshire, that gentleman related the following account of Hampden's death. That at the action of Chalgrove Field his pistol burst, and shattered his hand in a terrible manner. He however rode off and got to his quarters, but finding his wound mortal, sent for Sir Robert Pye, then a colonel in the Parliament army, and who had married his [eldest] daughter, and told him that he looked on him as in some degree accessory to his death, as the pistols were a present from him. Sir Robert assured him that he bought them in Paris of an eminent maker, and had proved them himself. It appeared, on

examining the other pistol, that it was loaded to the muzzle with several supernumerary charges, owing to the carelessness of a servant, who was ordered to see that the pistols were loaded every morning, which he did, without drawing the former charge."

It would therefore seem, from the weight of traditionary authority, that the great patriot lost his life accidentally and was *not* slain on Chalgrove Field by the enemy. — (xii. 271.)

THE TALISMAN OF CHARLEMAGNE.

Many years back, "Prince" Louis Napoleon was stated to be in possession of the talisman of Charlemagne; — "a small nut, in a gold filigree envelopment, found round the neck of that monarch on the opening of his tomb, and given by the town of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) to Buonaparte, and by him to his favourite Hortense, *ci-devant* Queen of Holland, at whose death it descended to her son," the present Emperor of the French.

The Germans have a curious legend connected with this talisman. It was framed by some of the magi in the train of the ambassadors of Aaroun-al-Raschid to the mighty Emperor of the West, at the instance of his spouse Fastrada, with the virtue that her husband should be always fascinated towards the person or thing on which it was. The constant love of Charles to this his spouse was the consequence; but, as it was not taken from her finger after death, the affection of the emperor was continued unchanging to the corpse, which he would on no account allow to be interred, even when it became offensive. His confessor, having some knowledge of the occult sciences, at last drew off the amulet from the inanimate body, which was then permitted to be buried, but he retained possession of it himself, and thence became Charles's chief favourite and prime minister, till he had been promoted to the highest ecclesiastical dignity, as Archbishop of Mainz and Chancellor of the Empire. At this pitch of power, whether he thought he could rise no higher, or scruples of conscience were awakened by the hierarchical vows, he would

hold the heathen charm no longer, and he threw it into a lake not far from his metropolitan seat, where the town of Ingethüm now stands. The regard and affection of the monarch were immediately diverted from the monk, and all men, to the country surrounding the lake; and he determined on building there a magnificent palace for his constant residence, and robbed all the ancient royal and imperial residences, even to the distance of Ravenna, in Italy, to adorn it. Here he subsequently resided and died: but it seems the charm had a passive as well as an active power; his throes of death were long and violent; and though dissolution seemed every moment impending, still he lingered in ceaseless agony, till the Archbishop, who was called to his bed-side to administer the last sacred rites, perceiving the cause, caused the lake to be dragged, and, silently restoring the talisman to the person of the dying monarch, his struggling soul parted quietly away. The grave was opened by the third Otto in 997, and possibly the town of Aachen may have been thought the proper depository of the powerful drug, to be by them surrendered to one who was believed by many, as he believed himself to be, a second Charlemagne.

In *The Illustrated London News* of 8th March, 1845, is an engraving professing to be a correct representation of this antique relic; but it is not there described as "a small nut, in a gold filigree envelopment," and gives the idea of an ornament much too large for the finger or even wrist of any lady: that paper says, —

"This curious object of virtù is described in the Parisian journals as, 'la plus belle relique de l'Europe;' and it has, certainly, excited considerable interest in the archæological and religious circles of the continent. The talisman is of fine gold, of round form, as our illustration shows, set with gems, and in the centre are two rough sapphires, and a portion of the Holy Cross; besides other relics brought from the Holy Land."

QUEEN MARY'S EXPECTATIONS.

Most persons have heard of the anxiety of Queen Mary I. for the birth of a child, and of her various disappointments; but may not be aware that among the Royal Letters in the State Paper Office are letters in French, prepared in expectation of the event, addressed by Queen Mary, without date, except "Hampton Court, 1555" (probably about May), to her father-in-law, the Emperor Charles V., to Henry II., King of France, to Eleonora, Queen Dowager of France, to Ferdinand I., King of Bohemia, to Mary, the Queen Dowager of Bohemia, to the Doge of Venice, to the King of Hungary, and to the Queen Dowager of Hungary, announcing to each the birth of her child, the word being so written *fil*, as to admit of being made *filz*, or of an easy alteration to the feminine *fille*, if necessary.

WHAT WAS THE DAY OF THE ACCESSION OF RICHARD III.?

Sir Harris Nicolas, in his *Chronology of History* (2nd edition, p. 326.) decides for June 26, 1433, giving strong reasons for such opinion. But his primary reason, founded on a fac-simile extract from the Memoranda Rolls in the office of the King's Remembrancer in the Exchequer of Ireland, printed, with fac-simile, in the second *Report of the Commissioners on Irish Records*, 1812, p. 160, gives rise to a doubt; for, as Sir Harris Nicolas states,

> "It is remarkable that the printed copy should differ from the fac-simile in the identical point which caused the letter to be published, for in the former the 'xxvijth of June' occurs, whereas in the fac-simile it is the 'xxvjth of June.' The latter is doubtless correct; for an engraver, who copies precisely what is before him, is less likely to err than a transcriber or editor."

This is most probably the case; but perhaps some of your correspondents in Ireland will settle the point accurately.—(iii. 351.)

This inquiry led to the following:—

I have examined the original inrolment of the entry upon the Remembrance Roll *ex parte Capitalis Rememoratoris Hiberniæ*, of the second year of Richard III., with the *fac-simile* of that entry which appears in the Irish Record Reports (1810—1815, plate 9), and I find that the *fac-simile* is correct. The accession of Richard III. is shown by the entry upon the original record to have taken place on the twenty-*sixth* day of June. This entry is, as I have stated, upon the roll of the second year of Richard III., and not of the first year, as stated by the said Record Reports, there being no Remembrance or Memoranda Roll of the first year of that monarch to be found amongst the Exchequer Records of Ireland. Upon this subject of Richard III.'s accession, I beg to transmit to you the copy of a regal table which is entered in the Red Book of the Exchequer, probably the most ancient, as well as the most curious, record in Ireland. Judging by the character of the handwriting of this *Tabula Regum*, I would come to the conclusion, that the entries prior in date to that of Henry VIII.'s reign have been made during the time of that monarch; or, in other words, that this table has probably not been compiled at any time previous to the reign of Henry VIII.

J. F. F.

Nomina Regum Angł post conquestū Wiłłi Bastard.

Wiłłs conquestor regnavit p - XXI anñ. Beried at Cane.
Wiłłs Rufus regñ p - - XIII anñ.
Henricus primus regñ p - - XXXVI anñ.
Stephñs regñ p - - - XX anñ.
Henr̃ scotus regñ p - - XXXVI anñ.
Henr̃ ꝑcius regñ p unū annū impfectum & ideo non deb̃ scribi.
Ric̃us regñ p - - - IX anñ.
Johes regñ p - - - XVIII anñ.
Henr̃ ꝑcius regñ p - - - LVI anñ.
Edwardus prim⁹ regñ p - - XXXV anñ.

Edwardus sc̄dus regñ p -	- XIX anñ.
Edwardus ꝟcius regñ p -	- L anñ. & CXLVIII dies.
Riĉus sc̄dus regñ p -	- XXII anñ. & C dies.
Henr̄ quartus regñ p -	- XIII anñ. q3 qr̄tiu⁹ anñ. XXIIIJ., II dies.
Henr̄ quint⁹ regñ p -	- IX anñ. & qr̄tiu⁹ anni LXIII dies.
Henr̄ sextus regñ p -	- XXXVIII anñ. quind & III dies.
Edwardus quartus regñ p	- XXII anñ. XXXVII dies.
Riĉus ꝟcius regñ p - -	- II anñ. đi.
Henricus septimus regñ -	- XXIII anñ. & dī sex sept̄.
Henricus octav⁹ regñ -	- XXXVIII añ.
Edwardus sextus - -	- VII añ.
Philipus et Maria - -	- V.
Elizabeth regina nunc -	- XLIII.
Jacobus qui hodie regnat	- XXII plane.

Carolus Rex.—(iii. 437.)

MARRIAGE CONTRACT OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS AND THE EARL OF BOTHWELL.

Among the curious documents which have been produced from time to time before the House of Lords in support of peerage claims, there have been few of greater historical interest than the one which we now reprint from the Fourth Part of the Evidence taken before the Committee of Privileges on the Claim of W. Constable Maxwell, Esq., to the title of Lord Herries of Terregles. It is a copy of the Contract of Marriage between Queen Mary and the Earl of Bothwell, which, although it is said to have been printed by Carmichael, in his *Various Tracts relating to the Peerage of Scotland, extracted from the Public Records,*

has not been referred to by Robertson, or other historians of Scotland, not even by the most recent of them, Mr. Tytler.

Mr. Tytler tells us that on the 12th of May, 1567, Bothwell was created Duke of Orkney, "the Queen with her own hands placing the coronet on his head," and that the marriage took place on the 15th of May at four o'clock in the morning in the presence-chamber at Holyrood; and that on the following morning a paper, with this ominous verse, was fixed on the palace gate:—

"Mense malas Maio nubere vulgus ait."

The Contract, which is dated on the fourteenth of May, is preserved in the Register of Deeds in the Court of Session (Vol. IX. p. 86), and as the copy produced before the House is authenticated—and consequently it may be presumed a more strictly accurate one than that which Carmichael has given—it seems well deserving of being transferred to our columns, and so made more available to the purposes of the historian, than it has been found to be in Carmichael's *Tract*, or is likely to be when buried in a Parliamentary Blue Book.

Decimo quarto Maij anno domini tc̃. lxvij.
Sederunt dni sessionis clericus reg̃ri.

In p̃ns of ye lordis of counsale comperit personale nae ry^{t} excellent ry^{t} heicht and michte princes Marie be ye grace of God queene of Scottis douieier of France on that ane pairt and ane ry^{t} noble and potent prince James duk of Orkney erl Bothule lord Hales crychtoun and Liddisdeall great admiral of ye realm of Scotland on y^{t} vy^{r} p^{t} and gaif in yis contract and appointnament following subscrinit w^{t} y^{r} handis and desyrit ye samen to be insert in ye bukis of counsale to haif ye strenth force and effect of y^{r} act and decreit thereupoun the q^{lk} desyre ye saidis lordis thocht reasonable and y^{r}for hes decernit and decernis ye said contract and appointnament to be insert and registret in ye said bukis to haif ye strenth force and effect of y^{r} act and

decreit in tyme to cum et ad perpetuam rei memoriam and hes interponit and interponis y^{r} autoritie $y^{r}$to and ordenis y^{r} autentik extract of the samen to be deliuerit to the foir-said partiis and the principale to remane apud registrum Off ye q^{lk} contract ye tennor followis At Edinburgh ye xiiii. day of May the year of God $I^{m}v^{c}$ thrie score sevin yeris it is appointit aggreit contractit and finale concordit betwix ye r^{t} excellent ry^{t} heich and mychte princess Marie be ye grace of God queen of Scottis douarrier of France on that ane pairt and ye ry^{t} noble and potent prince James duke of Orkney erle Bothul lord Hales creychtoun and Liddisdeall great admiral of yis realm of Scotland on y^{t} vy^{r} p^{t} in manner forme and effect as efter followis that is to say fforsamekle as her majestie considering w^{t} hirself how almycte God hes not onlie placit and constitut hir hienes to reigne over this realme and during hir liftyme to governe ye peple and inhabitantis $y^{r}$of hir native subjects bot als that of hir royall persoun succession my^{t} be producit to enioy and posses yis kingdome and dominionis $y^{r}$of quhen God sall call hir hienes to his mercie out of yis mortale life and how grecousle it hes plesit him alredy to respect hir hienes and yis hir realme in geving vnto hir maistie of her mest deir and onlie sone ye prince baith her heines self and hir heill subjects are detbond to render vnto God immortale prayss and thankis and now hir maistie being destitute of ane husband levand soliterie in ye estate of wedoheid and yet young and of flurisshing aige apt and able to procreat and bring furth ma childreyn hes been pressit and humble requirit to yeild vnto sum mariege quhilk petitioun hir grece weying and teking in gud pairt bot cheifle regarding ye preservatioun and continewance of hir posteritie hes condescendit $y^{r}$to and mature deliberatioun being had towert psonage of him w^{t} quhome hir heines sall joyne in marriage ye maist p^{t} of hir nobilitie be way of adviss hes humblie preyit hir maistie and thocht bettir that she sculd sefar humble hirself as to accept ane of hir awin borne subiectis in y state and place that war accustomet w^{t} ye manneris lawis and consuetud of yis cuntre rether yan ony

foreyne prince and hir maistie preferrand their aduyse and preyeris with ye welfeir of hir relm to the avansment and promotion q̃lk hir heines in pticuler mycht heve be foreyn marriage hes in that point likwis inclinit to ye suit of hir said nobilitie and yai nemand ye said noble prince now duke of Orkney for ye speciall personage hir maistie well aduisit hes allowit yair motioun and nominatioun and gratiouslie accedit y^{r}vnto having recent memorie of the notable and worthie actis and gude service done and performit be him to hir m^{tie} als weill sen hir returning and arivall in this realme as of befoir in hir hienes minoritie and dureing the tyme of governament of umq^{ll} hir dearest moder of gude memorie in the furth setting of her ma^{ties} authoritie agains all impugnaris and ganestanders y^{r}of quhais magnanimitie couraige and constant trewth towert her ma^{tie} in preservation of hir awn person from mony evident and greit dangers and in conducting of heich and profitable purposes tending to her hienes avancement and establissing of this countre to hir profite and universall obedience hes sa fer movit her and procurit hir favour and affectioun that abuist the common and accustomat gude grace and benevolence quhilk princesses usis to bestow on noblemen thair subjectis weill deserving hir ma^{tie} wil be content to resaue and tak to hir husband the said noble prince for satisfaction of the hearts of hir nobilitie and people and to the effect that hir ma^{tie} may be the mair able to govern and rewill this realme in tyme to cum dureing hir liftyme and that issue and succession at Goddis plesure may be producit of hir maist noble persoun quhilkis being sa dear and tender to hir said dearest son eftir hir ma^{ties} deceas may befoir all oyris serve ayd and comfort him Quhairfore the said excellent and michtie princesse and queene and the said noble and potent prince James duke of Orknay sall God willing solemnizat and compleit the band of metrimony aither of them with vther in face of haly kirk w^{t} all gudly diligence and als hir ma^{tie} in respect of the same metrimony and of the succession at Goddis plesure to be procreat betwix thame and producit of hir body sall in her nixt parliament grant

ane ratificatioun w^t aviss of hir thrie estates quhilk hir ma^tie sall obtene of the infeftment maid be hir to the said noble prince then erll Boithuill and his airis maill to be gottin of his body quhilkis failzeing to hir hienes and hir crown to returne off all & haill the erlldome landis and ilis of Orknay and lordship of Zetland with the holmes skeireis quylandis outbrekkis castells towrs fortalices manner places milns multures woddis cunninghares ffishingis as weill in ffresh watters as salt havynis portis raidis outsettis parts pendicles tennentis tennendries service of frie tennents advocation donation and richt of patronage of kirkis benefices & chaplanries of the samyn lyand w^tin the sherifdom of Orknay and ffowdry of Zetland respective with the toll and customs within the saidis boundis togidder with the offices of sherifship of Orknay and ffowdry of Zetland and office of justiciarie w^tin all the boundis als weill of Orknay as Zetland with all priviledges fies liborties and dewities perteining and belanging y^rto and all thair pertinentis erectit in ane haill and frie dukrie to be callit the dukrie of Orknay for evir and gif neid be sall mak him new infeftment thairvpoun in competent and dew form quhilk hir ma^tie promittis in verbo principis and in caiss as God forbid thair beis na airis maill procreat betwix hir ma^tie and the said prince he obleiss his other airis maill to be gottin of his body to renunce the halding of blenchferme contenit in the said infeftment takand alwyis and ressavand new infeftment of the saidis landis erlldome lordships ilis toll customs and offices abovewryten and all thair pertinentis erectit in an dukrie as said is quhilk name and titill it sall alwyis retene notwithstanding the alteratioun of the halding his saidis airis maill to be gottin of his body payand zeirlie thairfore to our said soverane ladies successoris y^r comptrollaris in y^r name the soume of twa thousand pundis money of this realme lykas the samyn wes sett in the tyme of the kingis grace her gracious ffader of maist worthie memorie Mairowir the said noble and potent prince and duke obleiss him that he sall no wayis dispone nor putt away ony of his lands heretages possessiones and offices

present nor quhilkis he sall happen to obtene and conquies heireftir dureing the mariage fre the airis maill to be gottin betwix him & her ma^tie bot yai to succeid to the same als weil as to the said dukrie of Orknay Furthermair it is concludit and accordit be hir ma^tie that all signateurs ŧres and wrytingis to be subscrivit be hir ma^tie in tyme to cum eftir the completing and solemnization of the said mariage other of giftis dispositiones graces privileges or vtheris sic thingis quhatsumevir sal be alsua subscrivit be the said noble prince and duke for his interesse in signe and taken of his consent and assent y^rto as her ma^ties husband Likas it is alsua aggreit and accordit be the said noble prince and duke that na signateurs ŧres nor writingis othir of giftis dispositions graces priviledges or others sic thingis concerning the affairs of the realme sall be subscrivit be him onlie and w^tout hir ma^ties aviss and subscription and giff ony sic thing happin the samyn to be of nane availl And for observing keiping and fullfilling of the premisses and every poynt and article y^rof the said noble and michte princesse and the said noble prince and duke hes bundin and obleissit thame faithfullie to otheris and ar content and consentis that this present contract be actit and registrat in the buiks of counsale and session ad perpetuam rei memoriam and for acting and registring hereof in the samyn buiks her ma^tie ordains hir advocattis and the said noble prince & duke hes maid and constitute m^rs David Borthuik Alex^r Skeyn his p̃rors con^tu^tie and sea^lie promittand de rato In witness of the quhilk thing hir ma^tie and the said noble prince and duke hes subscrivit this present contract with thair hands day yeir and place foirsaids befoir thir witnesses ane maist reverend ffader in God Johnne archbishop of Sant Andrews commendator of paisly & George erll of Huntlie lord Gordon and Badzeneth chencelar of Scotland &c. Danid erll of Cranfurd lord Lindsay Andro erll^s of Rothes lord Leslie Alexander bishop of Galloway commendator of Inchaffray John bishop of Ross Johnne lord fflemyng Johnne lord Hereiss W^m Maitland of Lethington youngar secretar to our soverane ladie sir Johne Bellanden

of Auchnoule knyt justice clerk and Mr Robert Crichton of Elioh advocat to hir hienes with oy[r]s diverss.

(Signed) Marie R.
James duke of Orknay.

TWO CHANCELLORS.

In a communication to *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. p. 257, Mr. Foss shows that on one occasion there were *two chancellors* acting at the same time for several months together, and both regularly appointed by the king.

It is a unique instance, occurring in the reign of Edward IV.: the two chancellors being Thomas Rotheram, Bishop of Lincoln, and John Alcock, Bishop of Rochester. The former received the Great Seal in May, 1474, in the fourteenth year of the reign, and without any doubt continued chancellor till the king's death; and yet, from April to September in the following year, the latter was also addressed by the same title. During that interval of five months, there are numerous writs of Privy Seal addressed by the king to both, in which each of them is styled "our chancellor."

This curious circumstance may be thus accounted for. King Edward had for some time been contemplating an invasion of France; and when his preparations were completed (about April), as he required his chancellor, Bishop Rotheram, to attend him on the expedition, it became necessary to provide some competent person to transact the business of the Chancery in his absence. On previous occasions of this nature, it had been usual to place the seal that was used in England, when the king was abroad, in the hands of the Master of the Rolls, or some other master in Chancery, with the title of Keeper: but, for some unexplained reason (perhaps because Bishop Alcock was a man whom the king delighted to honour), this prelate was dignified with the superior designation, although Bishop Rotheram still retained it. The voyage being delayed from April to July, during the whole of that period, each being

in England, both acted in the same character; Privy Seals, as I have said, being sent to both, and bills in Chancery being addressed also to Bishop Alcock as chancellor. Rotheram was with the king in France as his chancellor, and is so described on opening the negotiation in August, which led to the discreditable peace by which Edward made himself a pensioner to the French king. No Privy Seals were addressed to Alcock after September 28; which may therefore be considered the close of this double chancellorship, and the date of Bishop Rotheram's return to England.

Who knows, adds Mr. Foss, whether the discovery of this ancient authority may not suggest to our legislators the division of the title between two possessors with distinct duties, in the same manner that two chief justices were substituted in the reign of Henry III. for one chief justiciary?

HENRY VIII. AND SIR THOMAS CURWEN.

The following quaint extract from Sandford's MS. *History of Cumberland*, now in the library of the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle, exhibits that "reknowned king," Henry VIII., in so good-natured a light, that we think it may amuse some of our readers. That the good knight and "excelent archer" should have been so outwitted by his son-in-law is a matter of some regret to one of his descendants:—

"Sir Thos. Curwen, Knight, in Henry the Eight's time, an excelent archer at twelvescore merks; and went up with his men to shoote with that reknowned King at the dissolution of abbeys: and the King says to him, Curwen, why doth thee begg none of these Abbeys? I wold gratify thee some way. Quoth the other, Thank yow, and afterward said he wold desire of him the Abbie of ffurness (nye unto him) for 20ty one yeares. Sayes the King: take it for ever: quoth the other, it is long enough, for youle set them up againe in that time: but they not likely to be set up againe, this Sir Tho. Curwen sent Mr. Preston, who had married his daughter, to renew the lease for him; and he even rennewed in his own name; which when his father-in-law questioned, quoth Mr. Preston, you shall have

it as long as you live; and I think I may as well have it with your daughter as another."

After some descents, this family of Preston, of the manor of Furness, terminated in a daughter, who married Sir William Lowther, whose grandson left his estates in Furness and Cartmell to his cousin, Lord George Cavendish, through whom they are inherited by the Earl of Burlington. As Harry the Eighth's good intentions towards Sir Thomas Curwen have been frustrated, his descendants must console themselves by knowing that the glorious old ruin of Furness could not be in better hands than his lordship's.

ANECDOTE OF THE BATTLE OF WORCESTER.

On the Bromyard road, some three miles and a half from the city of Worcester, is Cotheridge Court, the manorial residence of the Berkeleys. The Mr. Berkeley who held it at the date of the battle of Worcester was a stout royalist, and went to help the falling fortunes of his king. It so chanced that he had two piebald horses, who were exactly like each other, "specially Sambo," as the niggers say. He made one of these horses his charger, and rode him to the fight. When Cromwell had gained his "crowning merits," Mr. Berkeley escaped to Cotheridge as best he might; and planning a very skilful *ruse*, left his exhausted charger at one of his farm-houses not far from the Court. He then betook himself to bed, and, as he had foreseen, a troop of crop-headed parliamentarists now made their appearance before his doors and sought admittance. Mr. Berkeley was ill in bed, and could not be seen. Fudge! they *must* see him. So they go to his bed-side. "So you were fighting against us at Worcester to-day, were you?" say the crop-heads. "Me!" says Mr. Berkeley. faintly and innocently; "why, I am sick, and forced to keep my bed." "All very fine," say the crop-heads, "but you were there, my dear sir, for you rode a piebald charger, and were very conspicuous." "It could not have been me," says the sick man, "for though I certainly do ride a piebald charger

when I am in health, yet he has never been out of the stable all day. If you doubt my word, you had better go to the stable and satisfy yourselves." So the crop-heads go to the stable, and there, of course, find piebald No. 2. as fresh as a daisy, and evidently *not* from Worcester. So they conclude that they had mistaken their man, and leave the sick Mr. Berkeley to get well, and laugh over the *ruse* he has so successfully played upon them.

Not far from Cotheridge, on the Bransford road, is an old roadside inn called "The White-hall," opposite to which is a cottage, the remnant of a larger house which stood there in 1651. A family of the name of Davis possessed it, and their descendants live there to this day. It has been traditionally handed down in the family, that, after the battle of Worcester, some of Cromwell's troopers came to the house and demanded refreshment. The woman brought it out, and said, "Before I give it you, I must ask who will pay me?" Upon which one of the troopers said, "Here is he who will pay you!" and, drawing his sword, flourished it in the woman's face.

CUTHBERT BEDE, B. A., vol. x. p. 259.

PROCLAMATION OF HENRY VIII. AGAINST THE POSSESSION OF RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

The progress of the Reformation in England must have been greatly affected by the extent to which the art of printing was brought to bear upon the popular mind. Before the charms of Anne Boleyn could have had much effect, or "doubts" had troubled the royal conscience, Wolsey had been compelled to forbid the introduction or printing of books and tracts calculated to increase the unsettled condition of the faith.

The following proclamation, now for the first time printed, may have originated in the ineffectual result of the cardinal's directions. The readers of Strype and Fox will see that the threats which both contain were no idle ones, and that men were indeed "corrected and punisshed for theyr

contempte and disobedience, to the terrible example of other lyke transgressours."

The list of books prohibited by the order of 1526 contains all those mentioned by name in the present proclamation, except the *Summary of Scripture;* and it will be seen that such full, general terms are used that no obnoxious production could escape, if brought to light. The *Revelation of Antichrist* was written by Luther.

Strype does not seem to have been aware of the existence of this particular proclamation, which was issued in the year 1530. Under the year 1534 (*Ecclesiastical Memorials, &c.*, Oxford, 1822, vol. i. part i. p. 253), he thus refers to what he thought to be the first royal proclamation upon the subject:

"Much light was let in among the common people by the New Testament and other good books in English, which, for the most part being printed beyond sea, were by stealth brought into England, and dispersed here by well-disposed men. For the preventing the importation and using of these books, the king this year issued out a strict proclamation, by the petition of the clergy now met in Convocation, in the month of December.

"Nor was this the first time such books were prohibited to be brought in: for as small quantities of them were secretly conveyed into these parts from time to time, for the discovering, in that dark age, the gross papal innovations, as well in the doctrine of the Sacrament as in image-worship, addressing to saints, purgatory, pilgrimages, and the like.

"A previous order (in the year 1526) was issued by the Bishop of London, by the instigation of Cardinal Wolsey, calling in all English translations of the Scripture. And other books of this nature were then forbid."

This proclamation, therefore, well merits preservation in your pages, as one of the hitherto unknown "evidences" of the terrible and trying times to which it refers.

It shows, too, the value of the class of papers upon which the Society of Antiquaries are bestowing so much attention. The original was found among a miscellaneous collection in the Chapter House, Westminster.

Joseph Burtt.

A PROCLAMATION.

. . . . nse Junii Anno regni metuendissimi Domini nostri Regis Henrici Octavi xxij.

A PROCLAMATION, made and divysed by the Kyngis Hignes, with the advise of His Honorable Counsaile, for dampning of erronious bokes and heresies, and prohibitinge the havinge of Holy Scripture translated into the vulgar tonges of englische, frenche, or duche, in suche maner as within this proclamation is expressed.

The Kinge, oure most dradde soveraigne lorde, studienge and providynge dayly for the weale, benefite, and honour of this his most [n]oble realme, well and evidently perceiveth, that partly through the malicious suggestion of our gostly enemy, partly by the yvell and perverse inclination and sedicious disposition of sundry persons, divers heresies and erronio[us] [o]pinions have ben late sowen and spredde amonge his subjectes of this his said realme, by blasphemous and pestiferous englishe bokes, printed in other regions and sent into this realme, to the entent as well to perverte and withdrawe the people from the catholike and true fayth of Christe, as also to stirre and incense them to sedition and disobedience agaynst their princes, soveraignes, and heedes, as also to cause them to contempne and neglect all good lawes, customes, and vertuous maners, to the final subversion and desolacion of this noble realme, if they myght have prevayled (which God forbyd) in theyr most cursed [p]ersuasions and malicious purposes. Where upon the kynges hignes (*sic*), by his incomparable wysedome, forseinge and most prudently considerynge, hath invited and called to hym the primates of this his gracis realme, and also a sufficient nombre of discrete, vertuous, and welllerned personages in divinite, as well of either of the universites, Oxforde and Cambrige, as also hath chosen and taken out of other parties of his realme; gyvinge unto them libertie to speke and declare playnly their advises, judgmentes, and determinations, concernynge as well the approbation or rejectynge of suche bokes as be in any parte

suspected, as also the admission and divulgation of the Olde and Newe Testament translated into englishe. Wher upon his highnes, in his owne royall person, callynge to hym the said primates and divines, hath seriously and depely, with great leisure and longe deliberation, consulted, debated, inserched, and discussed the premisses: and finally, by all their free assentes, consentes, and agrementes, concluded, resolved, and determyned, that these bokes ensuynge, that is to say, the boke entitled the wicked Mammona, the boke named the Obedience of a Christen Man, the Supplication of Beggars, and the boke called the Revelation of Antichrist, the Summary of Scripture, and divers other bokes made in the englisshe tonge, and imprinted beyonde y^e^ see, do conteyne in them pestiferous errours and blasphemies; and for that cause, shall from hensforth be reputed and taken of all men, for bokes of heresie, and worthy to be dampned, and put in perpetuall oblivion. The kingis said highnes therfore straitly chargeth and commandeth, all and every his subjectes, of what astate or condition so ever he or they be, as they wyll avoyde his high indignacion and most grevous displeasure, that they from hensforth do not bye, receyve, or have, any of the bokes before named, or any other boke, beinge in the englisshe tonge, and printed beyonde the see, of what matter so ever it be, or any copie written, drawen out of the same, or the same bokes in the frenche or duche tonge. And to the entent that his highnes wylbe asserteyned, what nombre of the said erronious bokes shal be founde from tyme to tyme within this his realme, his highnes therfore chargeth and commaundeth, that all and every person or persones, whiche hath or hereafter shall have, any boke or bokes in the englisshe tonge, printed beyonde the see, as is afore written, or any of the sayde erronious bokes in the frenche or duche tonge: that he or they, within fyftene dayes nexte after the publisshynge of this present proclamation, do actually delyver or sende the same bokes and every of them to the bisshop of the diocese, wherin he or they dwelleth, or to his commissary, or els before good testimonie, to theyr curate or parisshe preest,

to be presented by the same curate or parisshe preest to the sayd bisshop or his commissary. And so doynge, his highnes frely pardoneth and acquiteth them, and every of them, of all penalties, forfaitures, and paynes, wherin they have incurred or fallen, by reason of any statute, acte, ordinaunce, or proclamation before this tyme made, concernynge any offence or transgression by them commytted or done, by or for the kepynge or holdynge of the sayde bokes.

Forseen and provided alwayes, that they from hensforth truely do observe, kepe, and obey this his present gracis proclamation and commaundement. Also his highnes commaundeth all mayres, sheriffes, bailliffes, constables, bursholders, and other officers and ministers within this his realme, that if they shall happen by any meanes or wayes to knowe that any person or persons do herafter bye, receyve, have, or deteyne any of the sayde erronious bokes, printed or written anywhere, or any other bokes in englisshe tonge printed beyonde the see, or the saide erronious bokes printed or written in the frenche or duche tonge, contrarie to this present proclamation, that they beinge therof well assured, do immediatly attache the saide person or persons, and brynge hym or them to the kynges highnes and his most honorable counsayle; where they shalbe corrected and punisshed for theyr contempte and disobedience, to the terrible example of other lyke transgressours.

Moreover his highnes commaundeth, that no maner of person or persons take upon hym or them to printe any boke or bokes in englisshe tonge, concernynge holy scripture, not before this tyme printed within this his realme, untyll suche tyme as the same boke or bokes be examyned and approved by the ordinary of the diocese where the said bokes shalbe printed: And that the printer therof, upon every of the sayde bokes beinge so examyned, do sette the name of the examynour or examynours, with also his owne name, upon the saide bokes, as he will answere to the kynges highnes at his uttermoste peryll.

And farthermore, for as moche as it is come to the herynge

of our sayde soveraigne lorde the kynge, that reporte is made by dyvers and many of his subjectes, that it were to all men not onely expedyent, but also necessarye, to have in the englisshe tonge bothe the newe testament and the olde, and that his highnes, his noble men, and prelates, were bounden to suffre them so to have it: His highnes hath therfore semblably there upon consulted with the sayde primates . . . . . discrete, and well lerned personages in divinite forsayde, and by them all it is thought, that it is not necessary th . . . . . to be in the englisshe tonge, and in the handes of the commen people; but that the distrib . . . the said scripture . . . . denyenge therof dependeth onely upon the discretion of the superiours, as . . . . . to the malignite of this present tyme, with the inclination of the people to erroni . . . . . the olde in to the vulgare tonge of englysshe, shulde rather be the occasyon of . . . . . people, than any benefyte or commodite to warde the weale of their soules. And . . . . . e have the holy scripture expouned to them by preachers in theyr sermons, ac . . . . . this tyme, All be it if it shall here after appere to the kynges highnes, that his sa . . . . . rse, erronious, and sedicious opinyons, with the newe testament and the olde, corrup . . . . ge in printe: And that the same bokes and all other bokes of heresye, as well . . . . . termynate and exiled out of this realme of Englande for ever: his highnes e . . . . . great lerned and catholyke persones, translated in to the englisshe tonge, if it sha[ll] than seme t . . . conv . . . his highnes at this tyme, by the hoole advise and full determination of all the said primates, and . . . discrete and subs . . . lerned personages of both universites, and other before expressed, and by the assent of his nobles and others of his moste hon[orab]le Counsayle, wylleth and straytly commaundeth, that all and every person and persones, of what astate, degre, or condition so ever he or they be, whiche hath the newe testament or the olde translated in to englysshe, or any other boke of holy scripture so translated, beynge in printe, or copied out of the bokes nowe beinge in printe, that he or they do im-

mediatly brynge the same boke or bokes, or cause the same to be broughte to the bysshop of the dyocese where he dwelleth, or to the handes of other the sayde persones, at the daye afore limytted, in fourme afore expressed and mencioned, as he wyll avoyde the kynges high indignation and displeasure. And that no person or persons from hensforth do bye, receyve, kepe, or have the newe testament or the olde in the englisshe tonge, or in the frenche or duche tonge, excepte suche persones as be appoynted by the kinges highnes and the bisshops of this his realme, for the correction or amending of the said translation, as they will answere to the kynges highnes at theyr uttermost perils, and wyll avoyde suche punisshement as they, doynge contrary to the purport of this proclamation shall suffre, to the dredefull example of all other lyke offenders.

And his highnes further commaundeth, that all suche statutes, actes, and ordinances, as before this tyme have been made and enacted, as well in y^e^ tyme of his moste gracious reigne, as also in the tyme of his noble progenitours, concernyng heresies, and havynge and deteynynge erronyous bokes, contrary and agaynst the faythe catholyke, shall immediatly be put in effectuall and due execution over and besyde this present proclamation.

And god save the kynge.

Tho. Berthheletus, Regius impressor excusit.
Cum privilegio.

LIST OF THE NAMES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS THAT ADVANCED HORSE, MONEY, AND PLATE FOR DEFENCE OF THE PARLIAMENT, JUNE 10, 11, AND 13, 1642.

The following communication was from Mr. F. Kyffin Lenthall : —

The following list of contributions, "in horse, money, and plate," swiftly filled in when the peril of an approaching collision in the field between the King and Parliament

was hourly becoming more imminent, at the outset of the civil war in the month of June, 1642, by members of the House of Commons, in accordance with a resolution they had just passed, inviting voluntary aid "for defence of the Parliament," or, in the emphatic but loyally-guarded language of one of the patriot contributors, "for maintenance of the true Protestant religion, *the defence of the king's person, his royall authoritie and dignitie*, our lawes, liberties, and privileges conjunctively," faithfully transcribed from an original (MS.) parliamentary minute-book of the period, has, notwithstanding the great historic interest attaching to such a document, never, I believe, yet been published.

As one of those comparatively slight "remnants of history" which, coming down the stream, has fortunately hitherto "escaped," as Lord Bacon expresses it, "the shipwreck of time," had it related to some infinitely less important phase than this, almost the first opening dawn, as it were, of actual hostilities in that most sublime of civil conflicts, the conflict of the seventeenth century, it would still, fragmentary though it be, have presented a valuable memorial addition to the already richly laden — would that in reference to this particular era we could yet say impartial! — page of English history.

A state paper, however, of, to say the least, high biographic and historic interest, has this once simple but significant record of the early sacrifices made by our illustrious ancestors, — the mere earnest, as it unhappily proved, of farther sacrifices and future sufferings in the "good old cause," as it shortly after, towards the close of the contest, came to be called, of constitutional liberty, — now become. Strikingly, because minutely, illustrative — confirmatorily so at all events — of the high and purely disinterested objects for which — admittedly, I believe I may say beyond all cavil or question in these "latter days" — the parliamentary reformers of 1640 first individually and collectively entered upon that great struggle, on the final issue of which, under Providence, the future liberties of Englishmen were to depend, when taken in conjunction

with its parent resolution, it none the less distinctly, because incidentally, marks the firm, unfaltering purpose, thorough determination, and steady, enthusiastic, earnest, enduring zeal, yet tempered by loyal respect to the person of the sovereign, with which, when on the very eve of "appealing to that high Being who gave them the rights of humanity," the "Commons of England" prepared to take the field.

Viewed simply, however, as an authentic cotemporary roll, quaintly, in the very language of the hour, setting forth the names, and indicating the resources, ability, or amount of devotion * to the public service of those distinguished men, who, having freely come forth at their country's bidding in her dark hour of difficulty and gloom, and once "put hands to the plough," now, when the great crisis had at length arrived, "looked not back," but nobly committed themselves, their lives, liberties, families, and fortunes, "for better for worse," to the doubtful issue of a gigantic quarrel in a just and glorious cause, such a memorial as this can scarcely be deemed unworthy of being rescued from the dust, oblivion, and neglect in which it has, apparently for now over some two hundred years, silently reposed.

It will be found to contain the names of many, the great majority, in fact, of those "giant patriots" and "fiery spirits" who originally constituted the "life and soul" of

* It would, perhaps, scarcely be fair, however, to infer *want of zeal* in any instance, even did (which is not the case) the amount of any particular subscription at first sight seem to warrant such an inference. The resolution itself, however, carefully guards against the possibility of any such construction, by expressly declaring that "inasmuch as the condition of the estates and occasions of men is not always proportionable to their affections, no man's affection shall be measured by the proportion of his offer, so that he express his good will to this service in any proportion whatsoever." *Excess of zeal*, on the contrary, may readily be traced in the liberal contributions brought in by Cromwell and other leading Parliamentarians. The "Resolution," or rather "Declaration," itself will be found *in extenso* on the Commons' Journals of this date. It is too lengthy to incorporate in these pages.

that immortally famous body, that mighty Sanhedrim, the Long Parliament,—a set of men fit to grapple with tyranny, to rescue the country from ruin, to rescue truth when pushed from the tribunal of the judges, and to vindicate the ancient, rightful, and free constitution of England, — a parliament, the name of which is still, after the lapse of two centuries, inseparably associated with unfading recollections of its possession of perhaps the noblest intellect, the highest qualities, and the most glorious heroism ever brought to the direction of great state affairs, — a parliament whose untiring labours, indomitable energy, daring enterprise, and undaunted courage in pursuit of freedom, fairly entitle it to the long-delayed but grateful recognition it has at length come to receive of its just claims to an imperishable renown.

If ever (vain expectation!) a history — one deserving of the name, I mean — of this august assembly, of this "the Father of Parliaments, which first rendered Parliaments supreme," and "the most remarkable Parliament that ever sat" (as Mr. Carlyle designates it), should be written, it will assuredly be in a keen and almost microscopic examination alone of the genuine archives of the period — of its monuments and its memorials, of its registers and its records, of its minutes and its journals, of its declarations and its ordinances, of its speeches and its dispatches, of its state papers, but, above all, of its domestic correspondence — by intelligent scrutiny, in short, into each and all its acts, and facts, and deeds, and "utterances," proveably identifiable as such, and by no longer rendering tame, servile "suit and service" to lying cotemporary Histories, and Chronicles, and Collections, and Lives, and Memoirs*, and similar apo-

*I must except Mrs. Hutchinson's fine *Memoirs* from the somewhat sweeping condemnation I have passed in the above sentence. Notwithstanding her undoubtedly strong political predilections, I believe a more conscientiously honest narrative was never given to the world, or a more faithful representation of the history of the times in which she lived written, than she has bequeathed to us in her admirable *Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. There is scarcely a pas-

cryphal "authorities," all more or less wanting in those three most indispensable cardinal virtues of professing narrative, to wit, accuracy, impartiality, and truth, that some dim perception, some faint realisation of those noble manifestations of human character in times of unprecedented difficulty and danger which the fierce antagonism and mortal strife of the civil wars either brought to light or gave birth to, — characters illumined, elevated, purified, and exalted by hourly sharing in the perils, and participating in the common glories and responsibilities by which they were surrounded,— will perchance eventually be arrived at.

F. Kyffin Lenthall.

Bessels-Leigh, Berks.

Booke of the Names of the Members of the House of Commons that advance Horse, Money, and Plate, for Defence of the Parliament, June 10th, 11th, &c, 1642.

Veneris x° Junii, 1642.

Sir Jo. Evelyn, jun., will bringe in fower horses and two hundred pownds in present money.

Mr. Long, fower horses and two hundred pownds in plate or money.

Sir Peter Wentworth, three horses, hundred pownds in present money.

Mr. Tomkins, two horses freely at his owne charge.

Mr. Arth. Goodwyn, one hundred pownds in ready money, and will mainteyne fower horses at his own charge.

Mr. Wm. Strode will mainteyne two horses at his own charge, and will bringe in fifty pownds and some plate.

Mr. Holles will bringe in three hundred pownds, and mainteyne fower horses, and sett them forth in buffe cotes and . . . . . .

Sir Sam. Rolle will mainteyne the paye of twelve horses.

Mr. Valentine will bringe in and mainteyne two horses.

Mr. Martin will bringe in and mainteyne six horses at his owne charge.

Mr. Serj[t] Wilde will bringe in and mainteyne two horses at his owne charge.

---

sage or incident in the whole book relating to public affairs which is not more or less borne out and corroborated either by the journals of the two Houses, or other indisputable evidence.

Sir Jo. Northcott, will bringe in two horses and men * presentlye, and fower more soe soone as hee can have them out of the country, and a hundred pownds in money.

Sir Gilb[t] Gerard will bringe in fower horses, and mainteyne them at his owne charge.

Sir Jo. Francklyn will doe the like.

Mr. Hampden will bringe in two hundred pownds in plate, and bringe in and mainteyne three horses.

Mr. Crue will bringe in two hundred pownds in plate, and mainteyne fower horses.

Mr. Pierrepointe will bringe in and mainteyne two horses, and bringe in an hundred pownds in money or plate.

Mr. Pym will bringe in and mainteyne two horses, and one hundred pownds, eyther in plate or money.

Mr. Nath. Fines will finde one horse, and bringe an hundred pownds in money.

Sir Rob[t] Pye will bringe in and mainteyne four horses, and laye downe, eyther in money or plate, two hundred pownds.

Mr. H. Darley will bringe in two hundred pownds.

Sir Ro. Coke will bringe in and mainteyne two horses, and bringe in one hundred pownds in money or plate. He offers the like for Sir Sam. Luke.

Sir Benj. Rudyard, an hundred pownds freely without interest, for defence of king, kingdome, and parliament conjunctivelv.

Sir F. Knollys, sen., will bringe in and mainteyne two horses for himself and two for his sonne.

Mr. Browne, of Dorset, will bringe in and mainteyne one horse, and bringe in an hundred pownds.

Sir W[m] Brereton will bringe in fower horses, and send them up as speedyly as hee can, and bringe in an hundred pownds in ready money or plate.

Mr. John Ashe will contribute weekly ten pounds towards the mainteyning of horse soe long as the service shall continue.

Mr. Edw. Ashe will bringe in fower horses and mainteyne them at his owne charge, and if there bee occasion to marche, will have five hundred pownds ready at an hour's warninge for the service.

Sir W[m] Litton will bringe in two horses and an hundred pownds.

Mr. Winwood will bringe in sixe horses, and sixe more if there bee need.

---

* The pay of a trooper in the service of the Parliament at this period was 2*s.* 6*d.* per diem, of which sum 1*s.* 4*d.* was for the "maintenance" of his horse. Foot soldiers received 8*d.* per diem.

Mr. Warten will bringe in two horses and a hundred pownds in money.

Sir Nath. Barndisten will bringe in two horses, and continue the five hundred pownds hee has formerly sent.

Sir Thos. Dacres will bringe in two horses, and, eyther in money or plate, two hundred pownds.

Sir Edm. Fowell will bringe in two horses, for king, kingdome, and parliament conjunctively.

Mr. Heueinghan will bringe in three horses and one hundred pownds in plate or money.

Mr. Nichells will bringe in two horses.

Ald. Penington will bringe two hundred pownds in money.

Sir Jo. Harrison will bringe in fower horses for himselfe and his sonne.

Sir Edw. Mentfort will bringe in two horses and mainteyne them.

Sir Harbottle Grimston will bringe in an horse and give twenty pounds freely.

Mr. Rolle will bringe in an hundred pownds.

Sir Ro. North will bringe in, in plate, an hundred pownds, and give it freely to this service.

Sir Thos. Woodhouse will bringe in two horses and two hundred pownds in plate or money.

Sir Edw. Hungerford will bringe in six horses.

Sir Dud. North will freely give sixty pownds.

Sir Rich[d] Buller will bringe in three horses for himself and his sonne F. Buller.

Mr. Rich. Trench of Plymouth will the next weeke pay in five hundred pownds lent by the towne, and five hundred pownds more, which he lends to this service. Sir Rich. Buller is appointed to return him thankes.

Mr. Glyn will mainteyne an horse, and bringe in an hundred pounds in money or plate.

Sir William Drake will mainteyne two horses, and bringe in two hundred pounds in money or plate, for the kinge and parliament conjunctively.

Mr. Drake will bringe in an hundred pound in plate, and have in readynes one horse.

Mr. Speaker * will mainteyne an horse, and give fifty pounds in money or plate.

* The amount of Lenthall's subscription, the "maintenance" of a horse, and "fifty pounds in money or plate" (no inconsiderable sum in those days), is perhaps scarcely open to remark one way or the other; but it may nevertheless be observed, that the "condition" of

Mr. Jeunour will mainteyne two horses soe long as this . . . . .
Sir Rich. Onslow will mainteyne fower horses for himself and his sonne.
Sir Sam. Owfield will mainteyne fower horses, and doe more if occasion shall bee.
Mr. H. Pethar [Qy. Pelham?] will bringe an hundred pownds.
Mr. Whittlock will mainteyne two horses.
Mr. Vassall will mainteyne one horse, and, if occasion bee, two more.

---

his "estate" at this period was certainly by no means "proportionable" to his "affections" to the public service.

In a letter to Secretary Sir Ed. Nicholas, still preserved, in the State Paper Office, dated the December preceding, he says, "I have now in this employment (that of Speaker) spent almost fourteen months, which hath so exhausted the labours of twenty-five years, that I cannot but expect a speedy ruin, and put a badge of extreme poverty on my children," and he therefore requests the king's permission, "to use my best endeavours with the House of Commons to be quit of this employment, and retire back into my former private life, whilst I have some ability of body left," &c. Owing to this letter probably, on the report of a Committee (of which Hampden was chairman) the House, at the King's recommendation, shortly afterwards, "in consideration of his great and extraordinary charges," voted him 6000*l.*, "of which, to this day," he writes, in 1660, "I have never received above the one half."

His cousin, Sir Thomas Tempest, the King's Attorney-General in Ireland, writing to him from Dublin the preceding August (1641), says: "Our worthy Speaker here and I often remember you both very hartily and truely lovingly. His employment here is, and hath been, very troublesome and extreamly chargeable both in *cost and lost*, wherein I doubt you partake with him and exceed; but, God be thanked, you have both great estates to bear that out, and truely they had need be so." (*Tan. MSS. Bibl. Bodl.*) In a vindication of himself, published in 1660, the "great estate," as well as the "cost and lost" of the Speakership, to which Sir Thomas alludes, are thus more fully explained: "When I was first called to be Speaker," he says, "I think it is known to most I had a plentiful fortune in land, and ready money too a good summe, and if I had continued my way of practice, I might as well have doubled my fortune as get what I did, because the estate I had then gained was the profits of my beginnings; and having lost now twenty years of the best part of my life, and the greatest of my advantages, it will appear I have been a greater loser than an improver of my fortunes by those public places I have with so much hazard and danger undergone. I received by

Mr. Ven will bringe in an hundred pownds in money, and will have a horse ready for himself and sonne allwayes, uppon . . . . .

Sir H. Heyman will bringe in one hundred pounds in plate or money and two horses, for the defence of the kinge, kingdome, and privileges of parliament and liberties of the subject.

Mr. Stevens will furnish two horses compleatly.

Mr. Ro. Goodwyn will bringe in one horse and fifty pownds in plate or money.

---

the last years of my practice *five and twenty hundred pounds by the year*, which I quitted when I was made Speaker, and instead of making any advantage by that, I added a great charge, keeping a great retinue and public table," &c. And he further affirms, "Of the 5*l.* per diem, due to the Speaker as Speaker, from my first sitting to my last, I never received one farthing," and (with the exception, of course, of the vote already mentioned) "I never had any recompense from the House in money, land, or by other reward, and from 1648 to the last time I sate, I never received any profit by fee or otherwise."

In Lord Somers's *Tracts*, vol. vii. p. 103., there is a letter (evidently addressed to Lord Goring) confirmatory of this statement, in which the writer says, "I am very glad you have given me an opportunity of vindicating my old friend the late Speaker. You cannot be unacquainted with the greatness of his practice before he was called to that employment, for I, having seen his accounts [can vouch] 'twas more than 2000*l.* per annum. In the first two years of his Speakership he kept a public table, and every day entertained several eminent persons, as well belonging to the Court, as Members of Parliament, &c. . . . . Immediately after, the unhappy war broke out, and it was his chance to have his fortunes in the activest parts of it, so that his estates for five years yielded him nothing." One of the "estates" thus referred to was that of Bessels Leigh, the old manor place of which (from its proximity to the royal quarters at Oxford) was once seized, and for a time garrisoned, by the King. (Whitelock's *Memorials.*) Of the Speaker's "hearty affection" to the public service, he had already in the preceding "short" parliament, as Chairman of the Ship Money Committee, and subsequently of the Committee of the whole House, given abundant proof. There was scarcely a committee, in fact, appointed, however remotely affecting any one of the three great questions which then so deeply agitated the public mind, viz. Religion, Privilege, and Supply, on which his name does not occur in the Journals, associated with the leaders of the popular party, Hampden, St. John, and Pym, &c., from his very first entry into the House. He had also previously declined to contribute to the king's expedition against the Scots.

Sir Gilb[t] Pickering will bringe in fower horses and one hundred and fifty pownds in money or plate.

Mr. Browne, of Kent, will bringe in an hundred pownds in money or plate.

Capt. Skinner will bringe in two horses.

Sir Thos. Walsingham will bringe in an hundred pownds in money or plate, and have two horses allwayes ready at fower-and-twenty howers warninge.

Sir Rob[t] Harley will furnishe two horses.

Mr. Purey will furnishe one horse.

Mr. Green will furnishe one horse and bringe in fifty pownds in plate or money.

Sir Edward Boyse will furnishe two horses, when there shall bee occasion, and bringe in fifty pownds in plate or money.

Mr. Prideaux will bringe in an hundred pownds.

Mr. Lucas will bring in fifty pownds in money and one horse.

Mr. Peard will bring in an hundred pownds and expect noe interest.

Mr. Rigby will send up one horse completely furnisht, if his countie bee in peace nine dayes after hee comes down.

Mr. Bagshaw will bringe in fifty pownds and expect noe interest, for the preservation of the kinge and parliament, accordinge to his protestation, oathe of supremacie, and allegiance, conjunctively and not divided, and in noe other manner.

Mr. Reynolds will furnishe out two horses, and bringe in an hundred pownds in plate.

Mr. Knightley will bringe in an hundred pownds in money and furnishe two horses.

Mr. Grantham will furnishe out two horses.

Sir Jo. Merrick will furnish two horses.

Mr. Oldsworth will subscribe fifty pownds and furnish an horse.

Mr. Kirle will furnish one horse.

Mr. Cromwell will bringe in five hundred pownds.

Mr. Ashton will bringe in two horses.

Mr. Jo. Moore will bringe in two horses.

Sir Beauchamp St. Jon will bringe in two horses.

Mr. Tate will bringe in two horses and mainteyne them.

Mr. Hobby will finde two horses.

Sir Jo. Holland will bringe in two horses ready furnisht, and an hundred pownds in money or plate, for maintenance of the true Protestant religion, the defence of the king's person, his royall authoritie and dignitie, our lawes, liberties, and privileges conjunctively.

Mr. Sam. Browne will bringe in one hundred pownds.

Sir Thos. Soame will bringe in two horses compleatly furnisht.

Sir Edw. Master will bringe in an hundred pownds presently, and an hundred pownds a month hence.
Mr. Thos. Moore will furnishe two horses.
Mr. Cornelius Holland will furnishe two horses.
Mr. White will bringe in an hundred pownds and expect noe interest.
Mr. Lawrence Whittacre will freely give twenty pownds.
Mr. Mathew will finde one horse and furnish fifty pownds in plate or money.
Mr. Downes will bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Millington will, for the present, bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Noble will bringe in one hundred pownds.
Mr. H. Herb[t] will furnish one horse
Mr. Edw. Mountague will bringe in an hundred pownds in plate or money for defence of the kinge and parlem[t] conjunctively, and not divided.
Mr. Tho. Laine will furnish one horse.
Mr. Fountaine will bringe in one horse.
Mr. Harris will give fifty pownds.
Mr. Geo. Buller will furnishe one horse.
Mr. Thos. Arundell will furnish one horse.
Mr. Rich. *Powerys* [Qy. Sir Rich. Price?] will furnish fifty pownds.
Sir Jo. Hippisley will completely furnish three horses.
Sir Jo. Curson will furnish two horses.
Sir Jo. Young will furnish with a free loane of two hundred pownds.
Mr. Fenis [or Ferris] will lend fifty pownds freely.
Mr. Thomas will lend fifty pownds freely.
Mr. Constantine will furnish one horse.
Sir Walt[h] Erle will furnish fower horses for himselfe and his sonne.
Mr. Roger Hill will bringe in an hundred pownds.
Mr. Ellis will bringe in an hundred pownds.
Mr. Ashurst will bringe in one horse.
Mr. Ralfe Ashton will bringe in two hundred and fifty pownds.
Mr. Harman will bringe in one horse.
Mr. Corbett will bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Owner will lend fifty pownds freely.
Sir. Jo. Fenwick will furnishe two horses.
Mr. Blakiston will bringe in fifty pownds.
Sir Thos. Sandys will bringe in an horse.
Mr. Spurstoe will bringe in two hundred pownds.
Sir Peter Wrothe will furnishe a horse.
Mr. Hunt will furnishe one horse.
Mr. H. Shelley will bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Rob[t] Nicholas will give twenty pownds freely.
Mr. Jo. Franklyn will bringe in fifty pownds.

Mr. Salway will bringe in and mainteyne one horse.
Serg^{t} Cresswelle will bringe in one hundred pownds.
Mr. Barker will bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Bosevile will eyther bringe in one horse or an hundred pownds.
Mr. W^{m} Thomas will bringe in one horse.
Mr. Jo. Wogan will send in one horse well furnisht.
Sir Hugh Owen will finde two horses.
Mr. Lowry will find a horse ready furnished.

Sabbathi xi^{o} Junij 1642.

Sir H. Ludlow will finde thre horses ready furnished, and, if occasion bee, three more.
Sir H. Vane will finde two horses ready furnished and mainteyne them.
Mr. Leigh will find one horse ready furnished and mainteyne it.
Mr. Searle will pret^{ly} bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Halloes will pret^{ly} bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Dowse will pret^{ly} bringe in fifty pownds.
Mr. Percivall and Mr. Tell } will presently bringe in fifty pownds apeece.
Collonell Goring will (as soone as his moneth's pay, due to him as governor of Portsmouth, comes in) expresse what he will doe in this service to w^{ch} hee hath soe much affec^{on}.*
Mr. Shuttleworth will bringe in one hundred pownds for himselfe and his sonne.
Sir Rob^{t} Craine will bringe in fower horses for the defence of the king and parliament not divided.
Mr. Gurdon will lend one hundred pownds freely.
Mr. Phillip Smith will lend forty pownds freelie.

Luna xiii^{o} Junij.

Sir Nevill Poole undertakes to bringe in fower horses for himself and his sonne.
Sir Jo. Finch undertakes to bringe in two horses.
Sir Ambrose Browne will finde two horses well furnisht.
Mr. Hayes will bringe in one hundred pownds towards this service, to be lent freely.

* The real extent of Goring's "soe much affection" to the "service" was pretty sufficiently indicated shortly after this by his declaring for the king and deliberately surrendering Portsmouth into the royal hands, which act of treachery he successfully accomplished on the 5th of August following.

Mr. Lowe of Calne will bring in one hundred pownds.
Mr. Gawdy will lend fifty pownds freely.
Sir Jo. Price will bringe in two horses, having convenient time given.
Mr. Hodges will bringe in two horses, or one horse and fifty pownds.
Sir F. Barnham will lend an hundred pownds freely.
Sir Wm. Waler [Waller] will finde fower horses and bringe in one hundred pownds.
Mr. Trenchard will finde one horse.
Sir Ro. Burgen [Burgoyne] will finde two horses.
Sir Tho. Barrington will underwrite for fower horses and bringe in five hundred pownds.
Sir W^m^ Masham will bringe in fower horses.
Sir Martin Lumley the like.
Mr. Herbert Morley two horses.
Mr. Younge one hundred pownds.
Mr. Tulse will give freely twenty pownds.
Mr. Stapley two horses.
Mr. Bents two horses.
Captayne Bents fifty pownds.
Mr. Fynes, senior, two horse.
Sir Ch. Yelverton, fower horse.
Sir Jo. Evelyn two horse.
Mr. Hungerford two horse.
Sir W^m^ Playter two horse.
Sir Thos. Jervoyse two horse.
Sir Hen. Wallop } eight horse.
Mr. Wallop }
Mr. Whithed two horse.
Mr. Campion one horse.
Sir Jo. Pots one hundred pownds.
Mr. George one horse.
Mr. Dunch fower horse.

It is somewhat remarkable, that there should be no perfect or complete roll of the names of the members of the Long Parliament in existence.

The best, undoubtedly (for it is almost the only one), is that constructed by Carlyle for his own use, in editing the *Cromwell Letters and Speeches*, with the third edition of which work it was subsequently incorporated; but even that, he admits, is most likely "not entirely free from error." Like all his works, however, it is little to say that it is accurate wherever accuracy is attainable; and, what-

ever its imperfections, it will ever be found invaluable for reference.

THE BATTLE OF SEDGMOOR, 1685.

The Rev. Henry Alford in vol. x. p. 320 writes as follows: —

I think the following may be not without interest to your readers. I had occasion to consult the registers at Weston-Zoyland a few days since, and at the end of one of them found this memorandum:

"*Ann Account of the Fight that was in Langmore, the Six of July 1685, between the King's Army and the D. of M.*

"The Iniadgement began between one and two of the clock in the morning. It continued near one hour and a halfe. There was kild upon the spott of the King's souldiers sixteen; ffive of them buried in the churchyard, and they had all Christian buriall. One hundred or more of the King's souldiers wounded; of which wounds many died, of which wee have no certaine account. There was kild of the rebels upon the spott aboute 300; hanged with us 22, of which 4 weare hanged in Gemmarek (?). Aboute 500 prisoners brought into our church, of which there was 79 wounded, and 5 of them died of their wounds in our church.

"The D. of M. beheaded,
July 15, A. D. 1685."

I also found, in the churchwardens' account for 1686, the following entries:

	£	s.	d.
"Item exp^{d} upon the ringers the 6 of July in remembrance of the great deliverance we had upon that day, in the year 1685	0	7	0
It. p^{d}. Ben Page, John Keyser (&c. &c.), for ringing when the King was in the more	0	5	0
It. p^{d} (&c. &c.) for taking up the glaxes (?) which was laid over brod ryne when the King was in the more	0	1	6
It. p^{d} Ben Page for nailes used about the glaxes	0	0	8
It. expended then in beere, and the next day when the King came through Culston	0	8	10
It. p^{d} Richard Board for carring the glaxe down to brod ryne	0	1	0"

What the "glaxe" is, no one can tell me, nor is any such word known to the western people.

One of our family, Richard Alford, was churchwarden in the year of the battle; and there is a legend in the family, that he, being a Monmouthite, thereby saved himself by bringing out to a party of the king's soldiers a jug of cider, which had the king's head on it, and thereby escaping question.

It does not appear from Macaulay that the king visited Sedgmoor the year after the battle; but from these entries it must have been so.

I may add, that the old registers at Weston-Zoyland are unusually full and perfect, but most miserably kept at present, being tumbled into a large chest with rubbish; and the parish book containing the above interesting entries is partly eaten by mice.

JOHN ROSS MACKAY.

The following is a quotation from Sir N. W. Wraxall's *Historical Memoirs of his Own Time*, 3rd edition. Speaking of the peace of Fontainbleau, he says, —

"John Ross Mackay, who had been private secretary to the Earl of Bute, and afterwards during seventeen years was treasurer of the ordnance, a man with whom I was personally acquainted, frequently avowed the fact. He lived to a very advanced age, sat in several parliaments, and only died, I believe, in 1796. A gentleman of high professional rank, and of unimpeached veracity, who is still alive, told me, that, dining at the late Earl of Besborough's, in Cavendish Square, in the year 1790, where only four persons were present, including himself, Ross Mackay, who was one of the number, gave them the most ample information upon the subject. Lord Besborough having called after dinner for a bottle of champagne, a wine to which Mackay was partial, and the conversation turning on the means of governing the House of Commons, Mackay said, that 'money formed, after all, the only effectual and certain method.' 'The peace of 1763,' continued he, 'was carried through and approved by a pecuniary distribution. Nothing else could have surmounted the difficulty. I was myself the channel through which the money passed. With my own hand I secured above one hundred and twenty votes on that

most important question to ministers. Eighty thousand pounds were set apart for the purpose. Forty members of the House of Commons received from me a thousand pounds each. To eighty others, I paid five hundred pounds apiece.' "

THE STATE PRISON IN THE TOWER.

The following communication was made by Mr. William Sydney Gibson of Newcastle-upon-Tyne : —

A paragraph has lately gone the round of the newspapers, in which, after mentioning the alterations recently made in the Beauchamp Tower and the opening of its "written walls" to public inspection, it is stated that this Tower was formerly the place of confinement for state prisoners, and that "Sir William Wallace and Queen Anne Boleyn" were amongst its inmates.

Now I believe there is no historical authority for saying that "the Scottish hero" was ever confined in the Tower of London; and it seems certain that the unfortunate queen was a prisoner in the royal apartments, which were in a different part of the fortress. But so many illustrious persons are known to have been confined in the Beauchamp Tower, and its walls preserve so many curious inscriptions — the undoubted autographs of many of its unfortunate tenants — that it must always possess great interest.

Speaking from memory, I cannot say whether the building known as the Beauchamp (or Wakefield) Tower was even in existence in the time of Edward I.; but my impression is, that its architecture is not of so early a time. It is, I believe, supposed to derive its name from the confinement in it of Thomas de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, in 1397. Of course it was not the only place of durance of state prisoners, but it was the prison of most of the victims of Tudor cruelty who were confined in the Tower of London; and the walls of the principal chamber, which is on the first story, and was, until lately, used as a mess-room for the officers, are covered in some parts with those curious inscriptions by prisoners which were first described in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries in 1796, by

the Rev. J. Brand, and published in the thirteenth volume of *The Archæologia.*

Mr. P. Cunningham, in his excellent *Handbook*, says:

"William Wallace was lodged as a prisoner on his first arrival in London in the house of William de Leyre, a citizen, in the parish of All Hallows Staining, at the end of Fenchurch Street."

Mr. Cunningham, in his notice of the Tower, mentions Wallace first among the eminent persons who have been confined there. The popular accounts of the Tower do the like. It was about the Feast of the Assumption (Aug. 15) that Wallace was taken and conducted to London; and it seems clear that he was forthwith imprisoned in the citizen's house:

"He was lodged," says Stow, "in the house of William Delect, a citizen of London, in Fenchurch Street. On the morrow, being the eve of St. Bartholomew (23rd Aug.), he was brought on horseback to Westminster . . . the mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen of London accompanying him; and in the Great Hall at Westminster . . . being impeached," &c.

The authorities cited are, Adam Merimuth and Thomas de La More. His arraignment and condemnation on the Vigil of St. Bartholomew are also mentioned by Matthew Westminster, p. 451. Neither these historians, nor Stow nor Holinshed, afford any farther information. The latter chronicler says that Wallace was "condemned, and thereupon hanged" (*Chron.*, fol., 1586, vol. ii. p. 313.). He was executed at Smithfield; and it is not improbable that, if, after his condemnation, he was taken to any place of safe custody, he was lodged in Newgate. The following entry of the expenses of the sheriffs attending his execution is on the Chancellor's Roll of 33 Edw. I. in the British Museum:

"Et in expens̄ t̄ misis fcis p̄ cosd̄ Vicet⁹ p̄ Willo le Walleys Scoto lat⁹ne predone puplico utlagato inimico et rebellione ℟ qui in contemptu ℟ p̄ Scociam se Regem Scocie falso fecāt nōiare t̄ t̄ ministros ℟ in p̄tibus Scocie intfecit atq̄ duxt excercitū hostilit contra Regē p̄ judiciū Cur̄ ℟ apud Westm̄ distr̄hendo suspendendo decollando ej̄ viscera concremando ac ej̄ corpus q⁹rterando cuj̄ corpis

quartia ad iiij majores villas Scocie tᵃnsmittebantur hoc anno . . . £xj *s.* x*d.*"

The day of the trial, August 23, is generally given as the date of his execution. It therefore appears that the formidable Scot never was a prisoner in the Tower.

The unfortunate Queen Anne Boleyn occupied the royal apartments while she was a prisoner in the Tower. From Speed's narrative, it appears that she continued to occupy them after she was condemned to death. On May 15 (1536) she was (says Stow)

"Arraigned in the Tower on a scaffold made for the purpose in the King's Hall; and after her condemnation, she was conveyed to ward again, the Lady Kingston, and the Lady Boloigne her aunt, attending on her."

On May 19, the unfortunate queen was led forth to "the green by the White Tower" and beheaded.

In the record of her trial before the Duke of Norfolk, Lord High Steward (see *Report of Deputy Keeper of Public Records*), she is ordered to be taken back to "the king's prison within the Tower;" but these are words of form. The oral tradition cannot in this case be relied upon, for it pointed out the Martin Tower as the place of her imprisonment because, as I believe, her name was found rudely inscribed upon the wall. The Beauchamp Tower seems to have been named only because it was the ordinary state prison at the time. The narrative quoted by Speed shows, however, that the place of her imprisonment was the queen's lodging, where the fading honours of royalty still surrounded Anne Boleyn.

ATHELNEY.

On the Isle of *Athelney* in Somersetshire is a stone pillar, inclosed by an iron railing, designed to point the traveller's eye to the spot, so closely associated with his earliest historical studies, with the burnt cakes, the angry housewife, and the castigated king. The pillar bears the following inscription:

"King Alfred the Great, in the year of our Lord 879, having been defeated by the Danes, fled for refuge to the forest of Athelney, where he lay concealed from his enemies for the space of a whole year. He soon after regained possession of his throne, and in grateful remembrance of the protection he had received, under the favour of Heaven, he erected a monastery on this spot and endowed it with all the lands contained in the Isle of Athelney. To perpetuate the memorial of so remarkable an incident in the life of that illustrious prince, this edifice was founded by John Slade, Esq., of Mansell, the proprietor of Athelney and Lord of the Manor of North Petherton, A. D. 1801."

JOURNAL OF THE EXPENSES OF JOHN, KING OF FRANCE, IN ENGLAND, 1359—60.

The following note, signed W. M. R. E., appeared in vol. v. p. 506 : —

Possibly some of the readers of "N. & Q." may remember that King John II. of France was taken prisoner by Edward the Black Prince at the battle of Poitiers, fought September 20, 1356. If not, I would refer them to the delightful pages of old Froissart, where, in the version of Lord Berners, they will see chronicled at length, —

"How Kyng John of Fraunce was taken prisoner at the Batayle of Poycters; how the Englyshmen wan greatly thereat, and how the Prince conveyed the Frenche Kyng fro Burdeaux into Englande."

I am induced to bring under the notice of your readers a curious roll, containing one year's expenditure (July 1, 1359, to July 8, 1360) incurred by the French king during his captivity in England. This important document has been very recently printed in the *Comptes de l'Argenterie*, and edited from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale by M Douët d'Arcq for the *Société de l'Histoire de France*. It may perhaps be well to state, that after the battle of Poitiers the heroic Prince Edward conducted his royal prisoner to Bordeaux, where he remained till the end of April, 1357. On the 24th of May following they both made their entry into London, "the Frenche Kynge mounted on a large whyte courser well aparelled, and the Prince on a lytell

blacke hobbey (*haquenée*) by hym." John was lodged at first at the Savoy Palace, but was removed shortly afterwards to Windsor Castle, at which place he was allowed to "go a huntynge and a haukynge at hys pleasure, and the lorde Phylyp his son with him." The document in question refers to the years 1359 and 1360, when the king was confined at Hertford Castle, at Somerton Castle in Lincolnshire, and lastly in the Tower of London. As this document, which is so intimately connected with a favourite portion of our history, has, I believe, received no notice from any English journal, and as it moreover affords many valuable illustrations of domestic manners, and of the personal character of the royal captive, I have made a few extracts from it for insertion in "N. & Q.," in the hope that they may prove interesting to the numerous readers of that useful and entertaining work.

"*Pigeons.* — A 'varlet Anglois' presents the king with '2 paire de pijons blans,' and receives in reward 1 noble, value 6*s.* 8*d.*

A dainty dish of Venison and Whale. — Pour le marinier qui admena par mer, à Londres, venoisons et balainne pour le Roy, 4 escuz.

A present of Venison from Queen Philippa. — Un varlet de la royne d'Angleterre qui asporta au Roy venoison que elle li envoioit, pour don, 13*s.* 4*d.*

The Baker's Bill. — Jehan le boulenger, qui servi de pain à Londres le Roy, par 2 mois ou environ, 5*s.* 2*d.*

Sugar. — 32 livres de sucre, à 10*d.* ob. livre = 33*s.* 4*d.* *N. B.* The grocer's bills for spiceries 'confitures et sucreries' are very numerous.

Honey. — Miel, 3 galons et demi, 16*d.* le galon = 4*s.* 8*d.*

The King's Breviary. — Climent, Clerk of the Chapel, is paid 6*d.* for a 'chemise au Bréviaire du Roy.'

Do Missal. — Jassin, pour cendal à doubler la couverture du Mesal du Roy, et pour doubler et broder ycelle avecques la soie qui y convenoit, 13*s.* 5*d.* = Li, pour 2 clos d'argent à mettre audit livre, 4*d.*

Do. Psalter. — Jehan, le libraire de Lincole [Lincoln,] pour 1 petit Sautier acheté pour le Roy, 6*s.* 8*d.*

Romances. — Tassin, pour 1 *Romans de Renart* [a burlesque poem, by Perrot de Saint Cloot or Saint-Cloud?] acheté par li, à Lincole, pour le Roy, 4*s.* 4*d.* — Maistre Guillaume Racine, pour un *Romans du Loherene Garin* [a metrical romance, by Jehan de Flagy] acheté par li pour le Roy, et de son comandement, 6*s.* 8*d.* —

Li, pour 1 autre Romans du *Tournoiement d'Antecrist* [a poem, by Huon de Méry], 10*s.**

Parchment. — Wile, le parcheminier de Lincoln, pour une douzainne de parchemin, 3*s.*

Paper and Ink. — 5 quaiers de papier, 3*s.* 4*d.* Pour encre, 4*d.*

Sealing Wax. — Une livre de cire vermeille, 10*d.*

Chess-board. — Jehan Perrot, qui apporta au Roy, 1 instrument appellé l'eschequier, qu'il avoit fait, le Roy d'Angleterre avoit donné au Roy, et li envoioit par ledit Jean, pour don à li fait, 20 nobles=6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*

Organs. — Maistre Jehan, l'organier, pour appareiller les orgues du Roy: — Pour 1 homme qui souffla par 3 jours, 18*d.*, &c. Pour tout, 58*s.*

Harp. — Le roy des menestereulx, pour une harpe achetée du commandement du Roy, 13*s.* 4*d.*

Clock. — Le roy des menestereulx, sur la façon de l'auloge (horloge) qu'il fait pour le Roy, 17 nobles, valent 113*s.* 4*d.*

Leather Bottles. — Pour 2 boteilles de cuir achetées à Londres pour Monseigneur Philippe, 9*s.* 8*d.*

Knives. — Pour 1 paire de coustiaux pour le Roy, 2*s.*

Gloves. — Pour fourrer 2 paires de gans, 12*d.*

Shoes. — Pour 12 paires de solers (souliers) pour le Roy, 7*s.*

Carpenter's Bill for windows of the King's Prison in the Tower. — Denys le Lombart, de Londres, charpentier, pour la façon de 4 fenestres pour la chambre du Roy en la Tour de Londres. C'est assavoir: pour le bois des 4 châssis, 3*s.* 2*d.* Item, pour cloux, 2*s.* 2*d.* Item, pour une peau de cuir, 5*d.* Item, pour 6 livres et demie de terbentine, 4*s.* 4*d.* Item, pour oile, 3*d.* Item, pour 7 annes et demie de toile, 9*s.* 4*d.* Item, pour toute la façon de dictes fenestres, 10*s.* Pour tout, 29*s.* 8*d.*

Saddle. — Godefroy le sellier, pour une selle dorée pour le Roy, estoffé de sengles et de tout le hernois, 4*l.*

Minstrels. — Le Roy des menestreulx pour don fait à li par le Roy pour quérir ses necessitez, 4 escuz=13*s.* 4*d.* Les menestereulx du Roy d'Angleterre, du Prince de Gales et du Duc de Lencastre, qui firent mestier devant le Roy, 40 nobles, valent 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* Un menestrel qui joua d'un chien et d'un singe devant le Roy qui aloit aus champs ce jour, 3*s.* 4*d.*

---

* Among the Royal MSS. in the British Museum is Guiart des Moulin's translation of Pet. Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, which was found in the tent of John at the battle of Poitiers. (Vide Warton's *Eng. Poetry*, vol. i. p. 90.)

Lions in the Tower. — Le garde des lions du Roy d'Angleterre, pour don à li fait par le Roy qui ala veoir lesdiz lions, 3 nobles=20*s.*

Visit to Queen Philippa. — Un batelier de Londres qui mena le Roy et aucun de ses genz d'emprès le pont de Londres jusques à Westmontier, devers la Royne d'Angleterre, que le Roy ala veoir, et y souppa; et le ramena ledit batelier. Pour ce, 3 nobles=20*s.*

Dinner with Edward III. — Les bateliers qui menèrent, en 2 barges, le Roy et ses genz à Westmonster, ce jour qu'il disna avec le Roy d'Angleterre, 66*s.* 8*d.*

A Row on the River Thames. — Plusieurs bateliers de Londres qui menèrent le Roy esbatre à *Ride-Ride* [Redriff *alias* Rotherhithe?] et ailleurs, par la rivière de Tamise, pour don fait à eulx, 8 nobles, valent 53*s.* 3*d.*

The King's great Ship — Les ouvriers de la grant nef du Roy d'Angleterre, que le Roy ala veoir en venant d'esbatre des champs, pour don à eulx fait, 33*s.* 4*d.*

A Climbing Feat on Dover Heights. — Un homme de Douvre, appelé *le Rampeur*, qui rampa devant le Roy contremont la roche devant l'ermitage de Douvre, pour don, &c., 5 nobles=33*s.* 4*d.*

Presents. — At Dover on July 6th, 1360, John dined at the Castle with the Black Prince, when an 'esquire' of the King of England brought to the King of France 'le propre gobelet à quoy ledit Roy d'Angleterre buvoit, que il li envoioit en don;' and the French King sent Edward as a present 'le propre henap à quoy il buvoit, qui fu Monseigneur St. Loys.' *N.B.* This hanap was a famous drinking cup which had belonged to St. Louis.

Newgate Prisoners. — Pour aumosne faite à eulx, 66*s.* 8*d.*

Pembroke Palace. — Un varlet qui garde l'ostel Madame de Pannebroc' [Marie de Saint Pol, Countess of Pembroke] à Londres, où le Roy fist petit disner ce jour, 2 nobles=13*s.* 4*d.*

Horse-dealing. — Lite Wace, Marchant de chevaux, pour 1 corsier acheté de li pour le Roy, 60 nobles=20*l.*

Cock-fighting. — Jacques de la Sausserie, pour 1 coc acheté du commandement Mons. Philippe à faire jouster, 2*s.* 8*d.*"

PUNISHMENT OF EDWARD PRINCE OF WALES, BY KING EDWARD I., FOR DISRESPECT TO A JUDGE.

Mr. William Sidney Gibson, vol. iv. p. 338, writes with reference to the occurrence: —

Mr. Foss has lately shown, in his valuable lives of *The Judges of England*, that historical accuracy has been sacrificed in representing Henry V., on his accession, to have

re-invested Sir William Gascoigne with "the balance and the sword." Lord Campbell, warned that chroniclers, historians, moralists, and poets had, without historical warrant, taken for true the story which Shakspeare has made so familiar to us, has, in his *Lives of the Chief Justices*, examined the evidence for attributing to the young king this act of magnanimity, and has affirmed (vol. i. p. 131) not only that Sir William committed the prince, but that he actually filled the office of Chief Justice under him when he became Henry V. The noble and learned lord has been at some pains to authenticate the story of the committal of the prince, and has shown that there is no sufficient reason for disbelieving that the dauntless judge did make "princely power submit" to justice; and he has brought forward also the probable sources of Shakspeare's information. But these are silent as to the reinstatement of the illustrious judge; and Mr. Foss has established that the young king lost no time in dispensing with the "well-practised wise directions" of Sir William Gascoigne. One is really sorry to be obliged to relinquish belief in the historical foundation of the scene to which Shakspeare has given such fine dramatic effect in his noble lines. My object, however, in now writing is to point out a circumstance in some respects parallel, which occurred in the reign of Edward I. In looking through the *Abbreviatio Placitorum*, I find the record of a judgment in Michaelmas Term, 33 Edw. I. (1305), in which a curious illustration is given of the character of that sovereign; for it appears that Edward Prince of Wales having spoken words insulting to one of the king's ministers (when and to whom I wish I could ascertain), the monarch himself firmly vindicated the respect due to the royal dignity in the person of its servants, by banishing the prince from his house and presence for a considerable time. This anecdote occurs in the record of a complaint made to the king in council, by Roger de Hecham (in Madox the name occurs as Hegham or Heigham), a Baron of the Exchequer, of gross and upbraiding language having been contemptuously addressed to him by William

de Brewes, because of his judgment in favour of the delinquent's adversary. The record recites that such contempt and disrespect towards as well the king's ministers as himself or his courts are very odious to the king, and proceeds —— but I will give the original:

"Que quidem (videlicet) contemptus et inobediencia tam ministris ipsius Domini Regi quam sibi ipsi aut cur' suæ facta ipsi Regi valde sunt odiosa, et hoc expresse nuper apparuit idem Dñs Rex filium suum primogenitum et carissimum Edwardum Principem Walliæ p̄ eo quod quedam verba grossa et acerba cuidam ministro suo dixerat, ab hospicio suo fere p̄ dimid ann' amovit, nec ipsum filium suum in conspectu suo venire p̄misit quousq̄ dicto ministro de p̄dicta transgress' satisfecerat. Et quia sicut honor et reverencia qui ministris ipsius Dñi Regi ratione officii sui fiunt ipsi Regi attribuuntur sic dedecus et contemptus ministris suis facta eidem Dño Regi inferuntur."

And accordingly the said William de Brewes was adjudged to go in full court in Westminster Hall, and ask pardon of the judge whom he had insulted; and for the contempt done to the king and his court was then to stand committed to the Tower, there to remain during the king's pleasure. (*Abb. Plac.* lib. impres. p. 257.)

Roger de Hegham occurs as a Baron of the Exchequer in 26 Edw. I., and died 2 Edw. II. (Madox, ii. 58.)

This produced the following communication from Mr. Joseph Burtt: —

I think considerable light is thrown upon this very remarkable incident by a letter of the prince himself to the Earl of Lincoln, dated Midhurst, June 14, which appears upon the Roll of that prince's letters lately discovered at the Chapter House, Westminster. (See *Ninth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, App. II., No. 5.) This letter has been printed in a paper by Mr. Blaauw in one of the volumes of the Sussex Archæological Society. For such of your readers as may not have either of these books at command, I will give the material part of the letter, translated:

"On Sunday, the 13th of June, we came to Midhurst, where we

found the lord the king, our father; the Monday following, on account of certain words which, it had been reported to the king, had taken place *between us and the Bishop of Chester*, he was so enraged with us that he has forbidden us, or any of our retinue, to dare to enter his house; and he has forbidden all the people of his household and of the exchequer to give or lend us anything for the support of our household. We are staying at Midhurst to wait his pleasure and favour, and we shall follow after him as well as we are able, at a distance of ten or twelve miles from his house, until we have been able to recover his good will, which we very much desire."

The Roll contains several letters which show how seriously the prince was affected by his father's displeasure, and how the king was appeased.

By the letter above quoted, the "minister" appears to have been the Bishop of Chester, then treasurer of the royal household. But the connexion between the prince's case and that of William de Brewosa does not appear, unless they were on intimate terms, as is not improbable: and the punishment of the prince himself is, in my opinion, referred to as a precedent or justification of the punishment imposed upon Brewes. That the severe punishment so imposed was richly deserved none can doubt who has read the report on the Roll.

To return to the prince's offence and punishment. He appears to have been nearly starved into submission, as the royal prohibition against supplying him with articles or money was obliged to be removed by a Letter Close directed to all the sheriffs, dated Ospring, 22nd July.

The whole transaction is highly characteristic of the firmness of the king. Whether the prince's letters which I have referred to make out a case of *harshness*, as regards some other circumstances, I will not now trouble you with. But while examining cotemporary documents illustrative of the prince and his correspondents, I met with an entry upon the Close Roll (33 Edw. I.) too strikingly illustrative of the determination and caution of Edward I. to be allowed to remain in its present obscurity.

On the 27th November the prince addressed a letter to

Master Gerard de Pecoraria, earnestly begging him to favour and forward the affairs of Ralph de Boldok, then Bishop Elect of London. The "affairs" in question were the removal of certain scruples instilled into the Papal ear against the approval of the bishop elect; a matter generally involving some diplomacy and much money. Master Gerard was employed by the Pope to collect various dues in England; and so his good will was worth obtaining. But the following Letter Close will show how he received his "quietus," as far as the King of England was concerned:

"The King to Ralph de Sandwich.—By reason of the excessive and indecent presumption with which Gerard de Pecoraria is making oppressive levies and collections of money in various places; by whose authority we know not, for he will not show it; and inasmuch as the same is highly derogatory to our crown, and injurious to our people, and many complaints have been made against him on that account; We command you to take the said Gerard before the Mayor and Sheriffs of London, and there warn him to cease from making the said levies, and to quit the kingdom in six days, *provided that at such warning no public notary be present, so that the warning be given to the said Gerard alone, no one else hearing. And be you careful that no one but yourself see this letter, or get a copy thereof.*"

Who can doubt that such a mandate was strictly carried out?

I regret that my memoranda do not preserve the original language.

And also the following from R. S. V. P.:—

Mr. Gibson will find that this story, as well as that relative to Sir William Gascoigne, is also told by Mr. Foss (*Judges of England*, vol. iii. pp. 43, 261), who suggests that the offence committed by Prince Edward was an insult to Walter de Langton, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry*,

* The Bishop of Chester and the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry is one and the same person,—the two bishoprics being identical, and almost as often called by one name as the other.

occasioned probably by the boldness with which that prelate, while treasurer, corrected the insolence of Peter de Gaveston, and restrained the Prince's extravagance.

BATTLE OF BRUNANBURGH.

The following note was communicated by Dr. John Thurnam, vol. iv. p. 249:—

It is remarkable that the site of this great battle, the effects of which were so important to the Anglo-Saxon power, remains to this day undetermined.

The several chroniclers who describe it give various names to the locality, though modern authors generally adopt the name of Brunanburgh, or "Town of the Fountains." Not however to insist on such variations in the name as Brunandune, Bruneberik, Bruneford, and Brumby, Simeon of Durham describes the battle as occurring at a place named Wendune, otherwise Weondune, to which moreover he assigns the further name of Ethrunnanwerch. The locality has been sought for in most improbable places, —in Northumberland and Cheshire. There can, however, be little or no doubt that this Waterloo of the Anglo-Saxons, as it has been called, is really to be found in the immediate neighbourhood of the Humber; though, whether on the northern or southern bank of that river seems quite uncertain: so far at least as the evidence hitherto adduced affords us the means of judging. In the Winchester volume of the British Archæological Association, Mr. Hesleden states his belief that he has traced the site of this battle on the south of the Humber, near Barton in Lincolnshire; but the evidence on which he grounds this opinion, whilst demanding for this locality further consideration, seems to me far from conclusive. Mr. Hesleden describes some curious earth-works in this situation, and thinks he has discovered the site of Anlaff's camp at Barrow, and that of Athelstan at Burnham (formerly, as he informs us, written "Brunnum"), where is an eminence called "Black Hold," which he thinks was the actual seat of the battle. At Barrow are

places called "*Barrow Bogs*" and "*Blow Wells.*" Does Mr. Hesleden think we have here any reference to the "fountains" giving their name to Brunanburgh?

It is very desirable, in a topographical and historical point of view, that the site of this remarkable contest between the Anglo-Saxons and the allied Scandinavians and British *reguli* under Anlaff, should be determined on satisfactory data; and the allusion to it by Mr. Hesleden, in a recent communication to "N. & Q." (vol. iv. p. 180), induces me to call the attention of your readers, and of that gentleman in particular, to some mention of this battle, topographically not unimportant, which is to be found in Egil's *Saga;* the hero of which was himself a combatant at Brunanburgh, under the standard of Athelstan, and which appears to have escaped the observation of those who have discussed the probable site of this deadly encounter. The circumstantial account to be found in the *Saga*, chap. lii. and liii., has not been overlooked by Sharon Turner, who however does not quote the passages having a special topographical interest. It is remarkable that the name of Wendune, for which among Anglo-Saxon writers there appears the single authority of Simeon of Durham, is confirmed by the testimony of the *Saga:* at least there can be little doubt, that the *Vinheida* of the *Saga* is but a Norse form for the Wendun or Weondune of the Anglo-Saxon chronicler. The natural and other features of the locality are not neglected by the author of the *Saga*, who describes it as a wild and uncultivated spot, surrounded by woods, having the town of *Vinheida* not far distant on the north. These particulars I take from the Latin of the *Saga;* but the reader of the Icelandic would possibly find more minute characteristics, which may have been lost in the process of translation. As, by his residence in the neighbourhood, Mr. Hesleden is favourably situated for the further prosecution of this inquiry, I should be glad to find whether his conclusion as to the site of the battle received confirmation, or otherwise, from the passages of the *Saga* to which I have now ventured to direct attention.

I may here observe, that if we consider the situation of *Jorvik*, or York, the capital of the then Norse kingdom of Northumbria, we shall perhaps conclude that it was on the Yorkshire rather than on the Lincolnshire side of the Humber, that —

"Athelstan, king,
of earls the Lord,
of heroes the bracelet-giver,
And his brother eke,
Edmund etheling,
life-long-glory,
in battle won
with edges of swords
near Brumby."

This conclusion is to some extent confirmed, when we connect with the above the tradition or historical fact, whichever we regard it, that it was after this battle that Athelstan, in redemption of a previous vow, made various costly offerings on the altar of St. John of Beverley, and endowed that church with great privileges, the memory of which exists to the present day. It must however be admitted, that such a presumption is anything but conclusive in regard to a topographical question of this description. In conclusion, I would suggest that the Domesday Book for Yorkshire and Lincolnshire should be carefully examined, in order to ascertain whether the place in question, under any of the names assigned to it, is there to be found.

A. N. writes as follows on this subject: —

The *Egils Saga* describes the duel between the armies of Olaf and Athelstan to have been fought in a *champ clos*, inclosed with branches of hazel, upon a space called the Vinheidi, or *heidi* of *Vin*, situate *near* (vid) or *in* (á) the Vinskogr, or forest of Vin. *Heidi* is a rough open space, with scrubs or bushes, such as furze, juniper, broom, &c. The *heidi* and the *skogr* were distinct, the latter affording shelter to the fugitives from the former, p. 290. The text,

both Norse and Latin, says, "Then he brought his army to the Vin-heidi. *A certain* town stood towards the north of the heidi." But a various reading in the note says, "to the town of Vinheidi, which was to the north of the heidi." But it seems as unreasonable for the town to be called Vinheidi, as Vinskogr. *Vin* should be taken for the name of the town, and the root of the other phrases. The downs or brakes called Vinheidi were inclosed with hazel, and lay between the forest, or skogr, and some river. The town, being Olaf's head-quarters, lay north of them. Athelstan occupied the nearest town to the south of the heidi. [Query, whether south of the river?] The northern town Vin is no doubt the Weon, from which the Weon-dune (downs of Weon, or heidi of Vin) was called. The other name given by Simeon Dunelmensis to that space is curious, as showing how well the spot was adapted for attack and pursuit, "eth-runnan-were," that is, "facilis-ad-opus-currendi." The name Brunanburg, probably signifying "the town of bourns," or watercourses, is unequivocally that of a town. Since Olaf or Arlaf had his quarters at Vin, it was probably at that place where Athelstan was stationed. Find these two places, Vin the northernmost of the two, and find the river. The heidi and the skogr are probably grubbed and ploughed up.

INEDITED LETTER FROM HENRY VIII. OF ENGLAND TO JAMES V. OF SCOTLAND.

The following was communicated by Mr. Thomas Nimmo: —

I lately transcribed several very interesting original manuscripts, chiefly of the seventeenth century, but some of an earlier date, and now send you a literal specimen of one evidently belonging to the sixteenth century; although, notwithstanding the day of the month is given, the year is not. If you think it worthy of a place in your very excellent publication, you are quite at liberty to make use of

it, and I shall be happy to send you some of the others, if you choose to accept them. They chiefly relate to the period when the Duke of Lauderdale was commissioner for Scotch affairs at the English Court; and one appears to be a letter addressed by the members of the Scottish College at Paris to James I. on the death of his mother.

Right excellent right high and mighty prince, our most dereste brother and nephew, we recommende us unto you in our most hertee and affectuous maner by this berer, your familyar servitor, David Wood. We have not only receyved your most loving and kinde let[s] declaring how moch ye tendre and regarde the conservation and mayntennance of good amytie betwene us, roted and grounded as well in proximitie of blood as in the good offices, actes, and doyngs shewed in our partie, whiche ye to our greate comforte afferme and confesse to be daylly more and more in your consideration and remembraunce (but also two caste of fair haukes, whiche presented in your name and sent by youe we take in most thankfull parte), and give youe our most hertie thanks for the same, taking greate comforte and consolacion to perceyve and understande by your said letters, and the credence comitted to your said familyar servitor, David Wood, which we have redd and considered (and also send unto youe with these our letters answer unto the same) that ye like a good and uertuous prince, have somoche to herte and mynde the good rule and order uppon the borders (with redresse and reformacion of such attemptats as have been comytted and done in the same), not doubting but if ye for your partie as we intende for ours (doe effectually persiste and contynue in so good and uertuose purpose and intente), not only our realmes and subjectts, shall liue quyetly and peasably without occasion of breche, but also we their heddes and gouernors shall so encrease and augment our syncere love and affecōn as shall be to the indissoluble assurammente of good peace and suretie to the inestimable benefit, wealth, and comoditie of us our realmes and subjectts hereafter.

Right excellent right high and mightie prynce, our most derest brother and nephew, the blessed Trynytie have you in his government.

Given under our signet at Yorke place besides Westminster, the 7th day of December.

Your lovying brother and uncle,

Henry VIII.

This letter, which is not included in the *State Papers*, "King Henry VIII.," published by the Record Commissioners, was probably written on the 7th December, 1524-25, as in the fourth volume of that collection is a letter from Magnus to Wolsey, in which he says, p. 301; "Davy Wood came hoome about the same tyme, and sithenne his hider comming hath doone, and continually dooth myche good, making honourable reaport not oonly to the Quenes Grace, but also to all other. He is worthy thanks and gramerces." This David Wod, or Wood, was a servant of the queen, Margaret of Scotland.

HENRY VIII.'S DIVORCE FROM ANNE OF CLEVES.

The following commission, issued by Henry VIII. before his divorce from Anne of Cleves, has never, we believe been printed. There is a copy of it among the Cotton MSS., much injured by the fire; but the original is enrolled on Patent Roll 32 Henry VIII., p. 7 m. (34) *in dorso*. The Privy Seal Bill on which it was framed is also in the Rolls Chapel:

"*Pro Rege.*] Rex Archiepiscopis Cantuariensii et Eboracensii ac ceteris regni nostri Angliæ Episcopis, Decanis, Archidiaconis, et universo Clero, salutem. Egerunt apud nos regni nostri proceres et populus, ut, cum nuper quædam emerserunt, quæ, ut illi putant, ad nos regnique nostri successionem pertineant, inter quæ præcipua est causa et condicio matrimonij quod cum illustri et nobili femina domina Anna Clivensi propter externam quidem conjugij speciem perplexum, alioqui eciam multis et variis modis ambiguum videat; Nos ad ejusdem matrimonij disquisicionem ita procedere dignaremur ut

opinionem vestram qui in ecclesia nostra Anglicana scienciam verbi Dei et doctrinam profitemini, exquiramus vobisque discuciendi auctoritatem ita demandemus ut si animis vestris fuerit persuasum matrimonium cum præfata domima Anna minime consistere aut coherere debere, Nos ad matrimonium contrahendum cum alia liberos esse vestro primum ac reliquæ deinde ecclesiæ suffragio pronuncietur et confirmetur. Nos autem, qui vestrum in reliquis ecclesiæ hujus Anglicanæ negociis gravioribus, quæ ecclesiasticam œconomiam et religionem spectent, judicium amplecti solemus, ad veritatis explicandæ testimonium omnino necessarium rati sumus causæ hujus matrimonialis seriem et circumstancias vobis exponi et communicari curare, ut quod vos per Dei leges licere decreveritis, id demum, tocius ecclesiæ nostræ auctoritate innixi, licite facere et exequi publice audeamus; vos itaque convocari et in synodum universalem nostra auctoritate convenire volentes, vobis conjunctim et divisim committimus atque mandamus, ut inspecta negocij hujus veritate, ac solum Deum præ oculis habentes, quod verum, quod justum, quod honestum, quod sanctum est, id nobis de communi consilio scripto authentico renuncietis, et de communi consensu licere diffiniatis: Nempe unum hoc a vobis nostro jure postulamus ut tamquam fida et proba ecclesiæ membra causæ huic ecclesiasticæ quæ maxima est, in justicia et veritate adesse velitis, et eam maturime juxta Commissionem vobis in hac parte factam absolvere et expedire. In cujus rei, etc. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium. vj die Julij."

ARE OUR LISTS OF ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS COMPLETE?

The following communication from J. J. S. appeared in vol. v. p. 28: —

It must have often occurred to students of English history that the current and usual lists of English sovereigns somewhat arbitrarily reject all mention of some who, though for short periods, have enjoyed the regal position and power in this country. There will at once occur to every reader the names (first) of the Empress Maud, who, in a charter, dated Oxford in 1141, styled herself "Matilda Imperatrix, Henrici regis filia, et Anglorum Domina;" (secondly) the young King Henry, the crowned son of Henry II: and (thirdly) Lady Jane Grey, who, in a few public and private documents, is cited as "Jane, Queen of England, Domina Jana, Dei Gratia Angliæ, Franciæ et Hiberniæ Regina," &c.

I am desirous now of calling the attention of your historical readers to the second case, my attention to the subject having been specially directed thereto by recently consulting the *Chronicon Petroburgense* (edited for the Camden Society by Mr. Stapleton), in which occur various notices of Henry, the crowned son of Henry II., as Henry *III.* I beg to quote these passages. Under the year MCLXIX. the chronicler records that —

"Hic fecit Henricus Rex coronare filium suum ab archiepiscopo Eborum."

Sir Harris Nicholas, in his *Chronology of History*, states that he was crowned on Sunday the 14th June, 1170. Benedictus Albus Roger, of Wendover, (*Flowers of History*,) says that "A D. 1170, on the 13th of July," the king's eldest son was crowned by Roger, Archbishop of York.

His wife, Marguerite of France, was also afterwards crowned in England, in consequence of her father's complaint that she had not been included in the former coronation of her husband, Henry the younger (Rex Henricus junior), as he was commonly styled in this country; *li reys Josves* in the Norman language, and *lo reis Joves* in the dialect of the southern provinces of France. He himself afterwards assumed the title of *Henry III.* regarding his father as virtually dead, owing to the fond, but thoughtless, assertion of his indulgent sire, at the period of the son's coronation, that "from that day forward the royalty ceased to belong to him," — "se regem non esse protestari." (*Vit. B. Thomæ*, lib. ii. cap. 31.)

The *Chronicon Petroburgense*, again, under the year 1183, records the death of the younger king in these words, "Obiit Henricus tertius rex, filius Henrici regis;" and afterwards notices the monarch usually styled Henry *III.* as "Henricus rex iiii^{tus}," Henry *IV.* Sir Harris Nicolas says, that Henry the younger is also "called by chroniclers Henry *III.*"

It is a curious point, because such a distinction must often surely have been made in the days of the jointly

reigning Henrys, and immediately after that time. The father and son certainly seemed to have been regarded as for years jointly reigning. For example, Roger of Wendover records that, in 1175, William of Scotland declared himself the liegeman of Henry, for the kingdom of Scotland and all his domains, and did homage and allegiance to him as his especial lord, "*and to Henry the king's son*, saving his faith to his father." In the following year both went through England, "promising justice to every one, both clergy and laity, which promise they afterwards fully performed." (Roger of Wendover.) Surely, then, for distinction sake, if not as a matter of right and custom, the younger Henry should have been always styled Henry III.; and if so, while he (not to mention the Empress Maud and Queen Jane) shall remain excluded, therefore, may I not again with some show of reason ask, are our lists of English sovereigns complete?

Mr. John Gough Nichols, vol. v. p. 113, writes as follows: —

The principal reason why the names of the Empress Matilda, King Henry junior, and Queen Jane (Grey or Dudley), are not inserted in the lists of English sovereigns, as J. J. S. suggests they should be, arises from the fact of the periods of their supposed reigns being concurrent with those of other monarchs, and our constitution recognising one only at a time. The name of Queen Jane has, however, found a place in some recent lists: following that given in Sir Harris Nicolas's *Chronology of History* (edit. 1833, p. 330), where he states that her nominal reign extended from the 6th to the 17th July, 1553. Appended to *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Queen Mary* (printed for the Camden Society), I have given a list of all the public documents or state papers known to be extant which bear date in the reign of Queen Jane, and the last is a letter of the Privy Council to Lord Rich, dated the 19th July; this extends the period two days longer than in the *Chronology of History*, and was certainly the last public document that recognised Jane's authority. Only

one *private* document so dated has been discovered. It is a deed relating to the parish of St. Dunstan's in Kent (dated fifteenth July), which was communicated by Mr. Hunter to the *Retrospective Review*, N. S. vol. i. p. 505. But an act of parliament of the 1st March, 1553-4, legalised all documents that might be so dated from the 6th of July to the last day of the same month (*Nicolas*, p. 316). Among our historians, Heylin, in his *History of the Reformation*, has apportioned a distinct division of his narrative to "The Reign of Queen Jane."

REGIMENTAL COLOURS BURNT BY THE COMMON HANGMAN.

"Fourteen rebel colours taken at Culloden were brought to Edinburgh on the 31st of May (1746), and lodged in the Castle. On Wednesday the 4th of June, at noon, they were brought down to the Cross, the Pretender's own standard carried by the hangman, and the rest by chimney-sweepers, escorted by a detachment of Lee's regiment. The sheriffs, attended by the heralds, pursevants, trumpets, city constables, &c., and escorted by the city guard, walked out from the parliament-close to the Cross, where proclamation was made by the eldest herald, that the colours belonging to the rebels were ordered by the Duke (of Cumberland) to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman. The Pretender's own standard was then put into a fire prepared for the purpose, and afterwards all the rest one by one, a herald always proclaiming to whom each belonged, the trumpets sounding, and the populace, of which there was a great number assembled, huzzaing. A fifteenth standard was burnt at Edinburgh with like solemnity, and another at Glasgow on the 25th. We have not heard that the device of a crown and a coffin, or the motto 'Tandem Triumphans,' was upon any of these, and it is doubted if ever there was any such standard, though it was currently so reported."— *Scots' Magazine* for June, 1746, vol. viii. p. 288.

Vol. x. p. 343.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS — HER MONUMENT AND HEAD.

There is in Grose's *Antiquarian Repertory*, second edition, vol. iii. p. 388, an account of a monument which was formerly to be seen in the Church of St. Andrew, at Antwerp,

to the memory of Mary Queen of Scots; and it is therein related, on the authority of "an ancient MS.," shown to the author by "a Flemish gentleman of consequence and learning," that two of Mary's attendant ladies, named Barbara Mowbray and Elizabeth Curle, buried the head of their unfortunate mistress there, having been permitted, on leaving England after her execution, to carry her head with them.

The following communications appeared in vol. v. p. 517, in answer to a query as to the truth of this strange story:—

"The monument to Mary Queen of Scots is still in existence; and consists of a richly ornamented slab placed at a considerable height from the pavement, against a pillar in the southern transept of the Church of St. Andrew. I was told on the spot that it was erected by two English ladies, but my informant was silent as to the tradition respecting the head. In the centre of the carvings which adorn the upper part of the monument, is inserted a medallion portrait of the beautiful but unfortunate queen; it is extremely well painted, and represents her in that peculiar costume so familiar to those acquainted with her accustomed style of dress. The following is a copy of the inscription:—

'Maria Stuarta,
Scot. et Gall. Reg.
Jacob. Magn. Britan. Reg. Mater.
Anno 1568, in Angl. Refugii causâ descendens.
Cogna. Elisab. ibi regnavit.
Perfidiâ. Senat. et Hæret. post xix. Captivit. Annos.
Relig. ergo. cap. obtrunc.
Martyrium consumavit. Anno D. N. 1587.
Æta. Regy. 45.'

"The wood-carvings with which this church abounds (especially those of the pulpit and its accessories), are marvellous efforts of art. M. W. B."

"The monument dedicated to the memory of their beloved mistress by the two noble ladies of the household of Mary Queen of Scots, Lady Barbara Mowbray, the wife,

and Elizabeth Curle, the sister, of Gilbert Curc, the queen's confidential secretary, still exists in the Church of St. Andrew at Antwerp. The *story* of the decapitated head having been borne away by these ladies, and buried at the foot of the pillar on which the monument is placed, which is alluded to by your correspondent, is too apocryphal for belief. There is no reason to suppose that any *head* of the queen was carried away by these devoted women into exile, excepting in the shape of her portrait painted on copper; which, instead of being interred *beneath* the monument, is still to be seen placed above the dedicatory inscription. It is true that in the edition of Descamps' *Voyage Pittoresque de la Flandre*, published at *Paris* and *Rouen* in 1769, it is stated the monument was surmounted by '*son buste en marbre*;' but this error was corrected in the *Antwerp* edition of 1792, where it is correctly affirmed to be '*son portrait peint*.'

"Mention is made of this crowned portrait, of a circular form, in Mackie's *Castles and Prisons of Queen Mary*, and of the close resemblance it bears to another in the possession of Lady Cathcart; who assured Mr. Mackie that the two portraits were painted by order of the queen, and presented by her to *two Scottish ladies*, but whose names are not mentioned.

"The following epitaph to the memory of these two faithful servants of the unhappy queen, has also been preserved by Jacques Le Roy in his *Théâtre Sacré du Brabant*, tom. ii. p. 90. It was copied by him from a blue marble slab placed over the entrance to the vault in which they were deposited:—

'D. O. M.

Sub hoc lapide duarum feminarum vere piarum conduntur corpora D. Barbaræ Mourray *et* D. Elisabethæ Curle *utræque Scotæ, nobilissimæ Mariæ Reginæ à cubiculis, quarum monumentum superiori affigitur columnæ. Illa vidua mortalium legi cessit* XXXI. *Julii anno* 1616 *ætatis* LVII., *dum hæc semper cælebs* XXIX. *Maii, ætatis* LX. *Dni* M.DC.XX.'

"In the inscription placed against the pillar, dedicated

to the memory of Queen Mary, Lady Barbara is said to be a daughter of Lord John Mowbray—*Barbara Moubray, D. Johan Moubray, Baronis F.* NURSE."

QUEEN ELIZABETH AND SIR PHILIP SIDNEY.

Among the objects of interest exhibited at the Museum of the Wilts Archæological Society at Salisbury in 1854, was a lock of hair of Queen Elizabeth's, which was found some time before at Wilton House, between the leaves of a copy of *The Arcadia.*

The hair is light brown, approaching to auburn, certainly not red, although with a reddish tinge. Its authenticity is set forth in a paper in an early hand, which states,—

"This Lock of Queen Elizabeth's own Hair was presented to Sir Philip Sidney by Her Majesty's owne faire hands, on which He made these verses, and gave them to the Queen, on his bended knee. Anno Domini 1573."

And pinned to this is another paper, on which, written in a different hand, said to be Sidney's own, we have the verses,—

"Her inward worth all outward show transcends,
Envy her merits with Regret commends;
Like sparkling Gems her Virtues draw the Sight,
And in her Conduct she is alwaies Bright.
When She imparts her thoughts her words have force,
And Sense and Wisdom flow in sweet discourse."

MEMORIALS OF THE DUKE OF MONMOUTH'S LAST DAYS.*

At a meeting of the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin, on 30th November, 1849, Dr. Anster exhibited a manuscript

* We were indebted to *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* for this interesting supplement to the various particulars respecting the capture of the Duke of Monmouth which had already appeared in our columns. It there forms the conclusion of an article on the last days

volume of 157 pages, which he declared to be the identical "album filled with songs, recipes, prayers, and charms," found in the Duke of Monmouth's pocket when he was seized. It was purchased at a book-stall in Paris, in 1827, by an Irish divinity student, was given by him to a priest in the county of Kerry, and, on the priest's death, became the property of the present possessor. Respecting its identity and history, from its removal from the rebel duke's pocket down to its production at the Royal Irish Academy, Dr. Anster showed that after Monmouth was beheaded — which he was on Tower Hill, by the too-celebrated John Ketch, on the 15th July, 1685 — the articles found on his person were given to the king. At James's deposition, three years afterwards, all his manuscripts, including those that had belonged to Monmouth, were carried into France, where they remained till the Revolution in that country a century afterwards. Dr. Anster, in exhibiting the book, showed that the remains of silver clasps had been destroyed, and a part of the leather of the covers at each side was torn away, seemingly for the purpose of removing some name on a coat of arms with which it had been once marked; and this he accounted for by the belief that at the period of the French Revolution the persons in whose custody they were, being fearful of the suspicions likely to arise from their possession of books with royal arms on them, tore off the covers, and sent the books to St. Omer's. The after-fate of the larger books was, that they were burned; some small ones, we are distinctly told, were saved from this fate, but seem to have been disregarded, and all trace of them lost. The Abbé Waters — a collateral descendant of Lucy Waters, the Duke of Monmouth's mother — was the person with whom George IV. negotiated for the Stuart papers, and from whom the volumes which have since appeared as Clarke's *Life of James the Second* were

of this unfortunate nobleman, founded on the communications which had been made to "NOTES AND QUERIES," and kindly adduced to show the utility of that paper.

obtained; and it is from the Abbé Waters we have the account of the destruction of King James's autograph papers. Dr. Anster showed, written on the inner cover of this volume, the words, "Baron Watiers," or "Watrers."

As to the identity of the book, Dr. Anster quoted several passages from contemporary authors to test their account of the contents of the "album" with those of the book he was describing. In the *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. vi. p. 323, it is stated in Sir John Reresby's memoirs, that "out of his [Monmouth's] pocket were taken books, in his own handwriting, containing charms or spells to open the doors of a prison, to obviate the danger of being wounded in battle, together with songs and prayers." Barillon describes the book in what is nearly a translation of this—"Il y avoit des secrets de magie et d'enchantement, avec des chansons des recettes pour des maladies et des prières." Again, in a note by Lord Dartmouth to the modern editions of *Burnet's Own Times*, we have the following statement:—

"My uncle Colonel William Legge, who went in the coach with him [Monmouth] to London as a guard, with orders to stab him if there were any disorders on the road, showed me several charms that were tied about him when he was taken, and his table-book, which was full of astrological figures that nobody could understand; but he told my uncle that they had been given to him some years before in Scotland, and he now found they were but foolish conceits."

The actual contents of the manuscript volume show a great resemblance to these descriptions. The most curious passages which it contains are the duke's memorandums of his journeys on two visits to the Prince of Orange, in the year previous to his last rash adventure. His movements up to the 14th of March, 1684–85, are given. The entries do not seem to be of much moment; but they may accidentally confirm or disprove some disputed points of history. There is an entry without a date, describing the stages of a journey in England, commencing with London and Hampstead: it ends with Toddington. This forms a strong link in the chain of identity; for Toddington is a place remarkable in the history of the duke. Near it was

the residence of Lady Henrietta Maria Wentworth, Baroness (in her own right) of Nettlestead, only daughter and heir of Thomas Lord Wentworth, grandchild and heir of the Earl of Cleveland. Five years before the execution, her mother observed that, despite the duke being a married man, her daughter had, while at court, attracted his admiration, and she hurried her away to Toddington. In 1683, after the failure of the Rye-House Plot, Monmouth was banished from the royal presence, and it was to Toddington he retired. When, on retracting the confession which he had made on the occasion, he was banished the kingdom, the companion of his exile was Lady Henrietta Wentworth.

"I dwell on this," said Dr. Anster, "because the accidental mention of Toddington seems to authenticate the book: the name of Lady Henrietta Wentworth does not occur in it, and the persons in whose hands the book has been since it was purchased in Paris do not seem to have noticed the name of Toddington, or to have known that it had any peculiar relation to the duke's history. It occurs twice in the book — once in the itinerary, and again in a trifling and unmetrical song, which is probably the duke's own composition; written probably on the eve of his flight with his romantic but guilty companion to Holland: —

'With joy we leave thee,
False world, and do forgive
All thy false treachery,
For now we'll happy live.
We'll to our bowers,
And there spend our hours;
Happy there we'll be,
We no strifes can see;
No quarrelling for crowns,
Nor fear the great one's frowns;
Nor slavery of state,
Nor changes in our fate.
From plots this place is free,
There we'll ever be;
We'll sit and bless our stars
That from the noise of wars
Did this glorious place give
(Or did us Toddington give)
That thus we happy live.'"

In Macaulay's history we find that the latest act of the duke on the scaffold, before submitting to the stroke of the executioner, was to call his servant, and put into the man's hand a toothpick-case, the last token of ill-starred love. "Give it," he said, "*to that person!*" After the description of Monmouth's burial occurs the following affecting passage:—

"Yet a few months, and the quiet village of Toddington, in Bedfordshire, witnessed a yet sadder funeral. Near that village stood an ancient and stately hall, the seat of the Wentworths. The transept of the parish church had long been their burial-plate. To that burial-place, in the spring which followed the death of Monmouth, was borne the coffin of the young Baroness Wentworth of Nettlestead. Her family reared a sumptuous mausoleum over her remains; but a less costly memorial of her was long contemplated with far deeper interest: her name, carved by the hand of him she loved too well, was, a few years ago, still discernible on a tree in the adjoining park."

In further proof of identity, Dr. Anster pointed out several charms and recipes which the manuscript volume contains. The conjurations are in general for the purpose of learning the results of sickness in any particular case, and of determining whether friends will be in certain circumstances faithful. There are also incantations for the cure of several maladies, and one to make gray hair grow black. No "charms against being wounded in battle," such as Sir John Reresby mentions, are to be found in the volume; but there are some prayers against violent death, which have the appearance of having been transcribed from some devotional book. There is evidently a mistake in supposing that this book contains any charm for breaking open prison doors, and it is likely that Sir John Reresby was misled in this way:—There is in p. 7 a charm in French to procure repose of body and mind, and deliverance from pains; and the word for "pains" is written in a contracted form; it might as well stand for prisons; but, examining the context, it is plainly the former word which is meant.

The rest of the entries consist of extracts from old recipe-books, mixed in the oddest way with abridgments of English history, and the most trifling memorandums, chiefly of a private and personal kind. Altogether, this commonplace work is highly indicative of the weakness, vanity, and superstition which stood forward so prominently in the character of the rash but unfortunate Duke of Monmouth. —Vol. i. p. 198.

It is reasonable to conclude, that the article copied from *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* furnishes the strongest evidence that can be adduced in support of the opinion, that the book in the possession of Dr. Anster is the one found on the Duke of Monmouth when captured, after his defeat at Sedgemoor; and, if so, it is impossible to admit the hypothesis, because a portion of the contents of the real book has been given to the world and contains matter far too important to have been passed over by Dr. Anster, had it existed in his volume. In the sixth edition of Dr. Welwood's *Memoirs of the most material Transactions in England for the last Hundred Years preceding the Revolution in* 1688, printed for "Tim. Goodwin, at the Queen's Head, against St. Dunstan's Church, in Fleet Street, 1718," the following passage is to be found at p. 147:—

"But of the most things above mentioned there is an infallible proof extant under Monmouth's own hand, in a little pocket-book which was taken with him and delivered to King James; which by an accident, as needless to mention here, I had leave to copy, and did it in part. A great many dark passages there are in it, and some clear enough that shall be eternally buried for me: and perhaps it had been for King James's honour to have committed them to the flames, as Julius Cæsar is said to have done on a like occasion. All the use that shall be made of it is, to give in the Appendix some few passages out of it that refer to this subject, and confirm what has been above related."

In the Appendix the following extracts are given from the duke's book:—

"*October* 13. L. came to me at eleven at night from 29, told me 29 could never be brought to believe I knew any thing of that part of the plot that concern'd *Rye House*; but as things went he must be-

have himself as if he did believe it, for some reasons that might be for my advantage. L. desired me to write to 29, which I refus'd; but afterwards told me 29 expected it; and I promis'd to write to-morrow if he could call for the letter; at which S. L. shew'd a great concern for me, and I believe him sincere, though 3 is of another mind.

"14. L. came as he promis'd and receiv'd the letter from 3 sealed, refusing to read it himself, tho' I had left it open with S. for that purpose.

"20. L. came to me at S. with a line or two from 29 very kind, assuring me he believed every word in my letter to be true; and advis'd me to keep hid till he had an opportunity to express his belief of it some other way. L. told me that he was to go out of town next day, and that 29 would send 80 to me in a day or two, whom he assured me I might trust.

"25. L. came for me to ——, where 29 was with 80. He receiv'd me pretty well, and said 30 and 50 were the causes of my misfortune and would ruin me. After some hot words against them and against S., went away in a good humour.

"26. I went to E—— and was in danger of being discover'd by some of Oglethorp's men, that met me accidentally at the back door of the garden.

"*Nov.* 2. A letter from 29 to be to-morrow at seven at night at S., and nobody to know it but 80.

"3. He came not, there being an extraordinary council. But 80 brought me a copy of 50's intercepted letter, which made rather for me than against me. Bid me come to-morrow at the same hour, and to say nothing of the letter except 29 spake of it first.

"4. I came and found 29 and L. there; he was very kind and gave me directions how to manage my business and what words I should say to 39. He appointed 80 to come to me every night until my business was ripe, and promis'd to send with him directions from time to time.

"9. L. came from 29 and told me my business should be done to my mind next week, and that Q. was my friend, and had spoke to 39 and D. in my behalf; which he said 29 took very kindly and had expressed so to her. At parting he told me there should be nothing requir'd of me but what was both safe and honourable. But said there must be something done to blind 39.

"15. L. came to me with a copy of a letter I was to sign to please 39. I desired to know in whose hands it was to be deposited; for I would have it in no hands but 29. He told me it should be so; but if 39 ask'd a copy it could not well be refus'd. I referred myself entirely to 29's pleasure.

"24. L. came to me from 29 and order'd me to render myself to-morrow. Cautioned me to play my part, to avoid questions as much as possible, and to seem absolutely converted to 39's interest. Bad me bear with some words that might seem harsh.

"25. I render'd myself. At night 29 could not dissemble his satisfaction; press'd my hand, which I remember not he did before except when I return'd from the French service. 29 acted his part well, and I too. 39 and D. seem'd not ill pleas'd.

"26. 29 took me aside, and falling upon the business of L. R. said he inclined to have sav'd him but was forc'd to it, otherwise he must have broke with 39. Bid me think no more on't. Coming home L. told me he fear'd 39 began to smell out 29's carriage. That —— said to 39 that morning that all that was done was but sham.

"27. Several told me of the storm that was brewing. Rumsey was with 39, and was seen to come out crying that he must accuse a man he lov'd.

"*Dec.* 19. A letter from 29, bidding me stay till I heard farther from him.

"*Jan.* 5. I received a letter from L. marked by 29 in the margin to trust entirely in 10; and that in February I should certainly have leave to return. That matters were concerted towards it; and that 39 had no suspicion, notwithstanding of my reception here.

"*Feb.* 3. A letter from L. that my business was almost as well as done; but must be so sudden as not to leave room for 39's party to counterplot. That it is probable he would choose Scotland rather than Flanders or this country; which was all one to 29.

"16. The sad news of his death by L. *O cruel fate!*"

Dr. Welwood cautiously adds, in a note:—

"That by 20 and 39 King Charles and the Duke of York seem to be meant. But I know not what to make of the other numbers and letters, and must leave the reader to his own conjectures."

There can, I apprehend, be little doubt that the L. R. under the date of November 26, were meant to indicate the patriotic Lord Russell.

The whole of these extracts possess the highest interest, establishing as they do several points referred to by historians. It is curious to remark the complete subjection in which Charles, at this period, stood towards his brother; occasioned, perhaps, by the foreign supplies which he scrupled not to receive, being dependent on his adhesion to the policy of which the Duke of York was the avowed re-

presentative. Shortly before his death, Charles appears to have meditated emancipation from this state of thraldom, and Hume says,—

"He was determined, it is thought, to send the Duke to Scotland, to recall Monmouth, to summon a parliament, to dismiss all his unpopular ministers, and to throw himself entirely upon the good-will and affections of his subjects."

This passage accords with the entries in Monmouth's pocket-book under the dates of Jan. 5. and Feb. 3. If the unfortunate Monmouth could have foreseen the miserable end, with all its accompanying humiliations and horrors, to which a few months were destined to bring him, his exclamation, "O cruel fate!" would have acquired additional bitterness. C. Ross.

These articles produced the following valuable and important communication from Sir Frederick Madden:—

In "NOTES AND QUERIES" (vol. i. p. 198) is inserted from *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* an account of a manuscript volume said to have been found on the person of the Duke of Monmouth at the time of his arrest, which was exhibited by Dr. Anster at a meeting of the Royal Irish Academy, November 30, 1849, accompanied by some remarks, which appeared in the *Proceedings* of the Academy, vol. iv. p. 411, and which furnish the substance of the article in *Chambers* above mentioned. In a subsequent number of the "NOTES AND QUERIES" (vol. i. p. 397), the authenticity of the volume is somewhat called in question by Mr. C. Ross, on account of certain historical entries not appearing in it, which are printed by Welwood in his *Memoirs**, and stated to have been copied by him from "a little pocket-book" which was taken with Monmouth, and afterwards delivered to the king. Dr. Anster replied to this in the *Dublin University Magazine* for June, 1850

* Query, what is the date of the *first* edition of Welwood's work? The earliest in the Museum library is the *third* edition, printed in 1700.

(vol. xxxv. p. 673), and showed by references to the *Harleian Miscellany* (vol. vi. p. 322., ed. 1810), and Sir John Reresby's *Memoirs* (p. 121, 4to., 1734), that more than one book was found on the Duke of Monmouth's person when captured. In the former of these authorities, entitled *An Account of the Manner of taking the late Duke of Monmouth, by his Majesty's command*, printed in 1685, and perhaps compiled from information given by the king himself, the following statement is made:—

"The papers and books that were found on him are since delivered to his Majesty. One of the books was a manuscript of spells, charms, and conjurations, songs, receipts, and prayers, *all written with the said late duke's own hand.* Two others were manuscripts of fortification and the military art. And a fourth book, fairly written, wherein are computes of the yearly expense of his Majesty's navy and land forces."

It is remarkable that the "pocket-book" mentioned by Welwood is not here specified, but it is possible that the entries quoted by him may have been written on the pages of one of the other books. Two of the above only are noticed by Mr. Macaulay, namely, "a small treatise on fortification," and "an album filled with songs, receipts, prayers, and charms;" and there can be no reasonable doubt that the latter, which is mentioned by the author of the tract in the *Harleian Miscellany*, as well as by Reresby and Barillon, is the identical manuscript which forms the subject of Dr. Anster's remarks.

Within a few weeks this singular volume has been added by purchase to the National Collection of Manuscripts in the British Museum, previous to which I ascertained, by a careful comparison of its pages with several undoubted letters of the Duke of Monmouth (an advantage Dr. Anster did not possess), that the whole of the volume (or nearly so) is certainly in the duke's handwriting. This evidence might of itself be deemed sufficient; but some lines written on the fly-leaf of the volume (which are passed over by Dr. Anster as of no moment) confirm the fact beyond all cavil, since, on seeing them, I immediately recognised them as

the autograph of King James himself. They are as follows:—

"This book was found in the Duke of Monmouth's pocket when he was taken, and is most of his owne handwriting."

Although the contents of this volume have been already described in general terms by Dr. Anster, yet it may not perhaps be uninteresting to give a more detailed list of what is written in it:—

1. Receipts "for the stone;" "to know the sum of numbers before they be writ doun;" "pour nettoyer l'ovrages de cuyvre argenté;" "for to make Bouts and Choos [Boots and Shoes] hold out water;" and to "keep the goms well."—pp. 1—4. 8.
2. Magical receipts and charms in French, written partly in an abbreviated form, accompanied by cabalistic figures. Two of these are to deliver a person out of prison, and are no doubt the same which Sir John Reresby refers to.—pp. 5. 7. 9. 11—17.
3. "The forme of a bill of Excheng," drawn on David Nairne of London, from Antwerp, May, 16, 1684, for 200*l.* sterling.—p. 6.
4. Astrological rules in French for finding out anything required; together with a planetary wheel, dated 1680, to show life or death in case of illness, also happiness and adversity.—pp. 19—25.
5. Directions "pour savoire si une person sera fidelle ou non," &c. At the bottom is a cypher, in which *a* stands for 10, *b* for 52, &c., p. 57. All this is entered again at pp. 45. 47.
6. "The way from London to East Tilbery," dated December 1, 1684.—p. 29.
7. Prayers for the morning and evening, pp. 31—43.
8. List of the Christian names of women and men.—pp. 44. 46. 48.
9. Arithmetical table of the number 7, multiplied from 1 to 37.—pp. 49. 51.
10. Receipts "to take away a corne;" "a soveraign water of Dr. Stephens;" "to make the face fair;" "to make golden letters without gold;" "to kip iron from rusting;" "to write letters of secrets;" "to make hair grow;" "to make hair grow black though of any colour;" and several more.—pp. 52—61.
11. Casualties that happened in the reigns of the English sovereigns, from William I. to Queen Mary, inclusive; consisting chiefly of remarkable accidents, and reputed prodigies.—pp. 62—78.
12. "Socrates, Platon, Aristote et Ciceron ont fait ces trente Comandemens pour leurs disciples."—pp. 78, 79.

13. "A receipt for the Farcy."—p. 81.
14. A poem entitled "The Twin Flame, *sent mee by M P.*"—pp. 83—91.

The words in italics have been scribbled over with the pen for the purpose of concealment. The verses commence:

> "Fantastick wanton god, what dost thou mean,
> To breake my rest, make mee grow pale and lean."

15. Receipts for secret writing, to take impressions of prints upon glass, to boil plate, &c. — pp. 93—98.
16. Several songs in English and French, pp. 99—107.

Among them are verses printed in "NOTES AND QUERIES," vol. i. p. 199, beginning "With joie we do leave thee," accompanied by the musical notes; and also a song commencing "All ye gods that ar above," with the musical notes. It is most probable that these songs are copied from printed sources; but as they have been conjectured to be compositions by Monmouth himself, the following short specimen may not be unacceptable, copied *literatim*.

> "O how blest, and how inocent,
> and happy is a countrv life,
> free from tumult and discontent;
> heer is no flatterys nor strife,
> for 'twas the first and happiest life,
> when first man did injoie him selfe.
> This is a better fate than kings,
> hence jentle peace and love doth flow,
> for fancy is the rate of things;
> I'am pleased, because I think it so.
> for a hart that is nobly true,
> all the world's arts can n'er subdue."

This poem immediately follows the one in which Toddington in Bedfordshire (which the duke spells, probably as then pronounced, *Teddington*) is referred to.

17. Prayers after the confession of sins, and the sense of pardon obtained.* — pp. 108—125.

* The paragraph quoted by Sir F. Madden out of *Prayers after the confession of sins and the sense of pardon obtained*, and well called

These prayers breathe a spirit of the most humble and ardent piety; and, if composed by the duke himself, exhibit the weakness of his character in a more favourable light than the remainder of the volume. One paragraph is striking: —

"Mercy, mercy, good Lord! I aske not of thee any longer the things of this world; neither power, nor honours, nor riches, nor pleasures. No, my God, dispose of them to whom thou pleasest, so that thou givest me mercy."

18. "The Batteryes that can be made at Flushing to keep ships from coming in."— pp. 127, 128.
19. "Traité de la guere ou Politique militaire."— pp. 130—132.
20. "The Rode that is to be taken from Bruxels to Diren, the Pri. of Orange's house."— p. 133.
21. "The Road from Bruxells to Sousdyck, the Prince of Orange his hous."— p. 134.
22. "The way that I tooke from Diren, when I went for England, Nov. the 10. 84."— p. 135.
23. "The way that I took when I came from England, December the 10th. 84."— p. 137.
24. "The way that I took the first day of Jan. n. st. [168$\frac{4}{5}$] from Bruxells to the Hague." — p. 139.
25. Similar memoranda from 11th to 14th March, 1685, between Antwerp and Dort. — p. 141.
26. The addresses of various persons in Holland, London, Paris, and elsewhere, to whom letters were to be written, 1685. — pp. 142. 147—155.
27. "The footway from Trogou to Amsterdam."— p. 143.

---

by him "striking," is a *verbatim* copy of a passage in "A Guide for the Penitent," published at the end of Jeremy Taylor's *Golden Grove*.

The short preface, by a nameless hand, which precedes this division of the *Golden Grove*, would lead one to suppose that "A Guide for the Penitent" was a posthumous work of Jeremy Taylor; but this is not exactly stated. The prayers, however, have the same spirit and grandeur of piety which characterise those which are the acknowledged compositions of Bishop Taylor. Monmouth was beheaded eighteen years after Taylor died. It would be interesting to identify the author of "A Guide for the Penitent" (should there be any doubt on the subject): also, to ascertain how far Monmouth *quoted*, in his "prayers," from Taylor or any other divine.

28. An obscure memorandum, as follows: — "1683. Munday the 5th of November. H. W. had T. — The 9th of November, Poupe. — The 16th of November, Poupe."— p. 156.
29. Value of duckatons, pistols, and gilders. — *Ib.*
30. Note of the route from London to Tedington. — p. 157.

Although this volume is not of the same historical value as the *Diary* mentioned by Welwood, yet it is a curious and interesting relic of the unfortunate man who possessed it, and whose want of education, superstition, and frivolity are so prominently displayed in its pages. As to its recent history, Dr. Anster states that it was purchased at a book-stall in Paris, in 1827, by an Irish divinity student; the same, probably, who has written his name at p. 90: "John Barrette, Irish College, Paris, Dec. 31, 1837." — The same person has made a memorandum in pencil, at p. 1, which has subsequently been partially rubbed out, and, as far as now legible, is as follows:—

"This Book was found in . . . . . of the English College in Paris, among other MSS. deposited there by James II."

An earlier hand has scribbled a list of the contents at the commencement, with the signature "S. Rutter." If King James deposited this volume in the College at Paris, in all probability the others found on the person of the Duke of Monmouth accompanied it, and may one day or other turn up as unexpectedly as the present book has done. —Vol. iv. p. 1. F. MADDEN.

I am anxious to acknowledge that SIR F. MADDEN has established, beyond all doubt, the facts that *several* manuscript books were found on the Duke of Monmouth when he was captured, and that the volume rescued from oblivion by Dr. Anster, and now placed in the British Museum, is one of these, and also in Monmouth's handwriting. I take this opportunity of saying that I, unfortunately, have not seen Dr. Anster's reply to my communication.

Referring unsuccessfully to Lowndes's *Manual* for an answer to SIR F. MADDEN's question as to the date of the first edition of Welwood's *Memoirs*, I was pleased, how-

ever, to find that my edition (the sixth, published in 1718) possesses a value which does not attach to previous editions, inasmuch as it contains "A short introduction, giving an account how these memoirs came at first to be writ." From this it appears that there are spurious editions of the work, for Welwood writes:

"I have given my bookseller leave to make a sixth impression of the following memoirs; and the rather that some time ago one Baker printed more than one edition of them without my knowledge, very incorrect, and on bad paper."

We may fairly assume that the first edition was published at the beginning of 1699, for the "epistle dedicatory" to King William is dated February of that year. If this be so, it must be taken as a proof of extraordinary popularity that the work should have reached a third edition as early as 1700, as stated by Sir F. Madden. The "account how these memoirs came at first to be writ" possesses some interest. It appears that Queen Mary used to hold frequent converse with the Doctor on the subject of her great-grandfather's and grandfather's history, and —

"At last she fell to regret the insuperable difficulties she lay under (for I well remember that was her mind) of knowing truly the history of her grandfather's reign; saying that most of the accounts she had read of it were either panegyrick or satire, not history. Then with an inimitable grace she told me, 'If I would in a few sheets give her a short sketch of the affairs of that reign, and of the causes that produced such dreadful effects, she would take it well of me.' Such commands were too sacred not to be obeyed; and when I was retiring from her presence, she stopt me to tell me she expected I would do what she had desired of me in such a manner, and with that freedom, as if I designed it for the information of a friend, and not one of the blood of King Charles I., promising to show it to none living without my consent."

Welwood further states that, after Mary's death, King William —

"Sent me, by the late Earl of Portland, the manuscript I had given his Queen, found in her cabinet; where, upon the back of it, she had writ with her own hand the promise she had made me of showing it to nobody without my consent."

In addition to the extract from Monmouth's *Diary* given in my former communication, Welwood publishes a letter of the duke's to the brave and true Argyle, which is perhaps more creditable to Monmouth than any other memorial he has left. The letter, as Welwood suggests, appears to have been written shortly after the death of Charles II. I copy it: but if you think this paper too long, omit it:

"I received both yours together this morning, and cannot delay you my answer longer than this post; though I am afraid it will not please you so much as I heartily wish it may. I have weighed all your reasons, and everything that you and my other friends have writ me upon that subject; and have done it with the greatest inclination to follow your advice, and without prejudice. You may well believe I have had time enough to reflect sufficiently upon our present state, especially since I came hither. But whatever way I turn my thoughts, I find insuperable difficulties. Pray do not think it an effect of melancholy, for that was never my greatest fault, when I tell you that in these three weeks' retirement in this place I have not only looked back, but forward; and the more I consider our present circumstances, I think them still the more desperate, unless some unforeseen accident fall out which I cannot divine nor hope for. [Here follow sixteen lines all in ciphers.] Judge then what we are to expect in case we should venture upon any such attempt at this time. It's to me a vain argument that our enemies are scarce yet well settled, when you consider that fear in some, and ambition in others, have brought them to comply; and that the Parliament, being made up, for the most part, of members that formerly run our enemy down, they will be ready to make their peace as soon as they can, rather than hazard themselves upon an uncertain bottom. I give you but hints of what, if I had time, I would write you at more length. But that I may not seem obstinate in my own judgment, or neglect the advice of my friends, I will meet you at the time and place appointed. But for God sake think in the mean time of the improbabilities that lie naturally in our way, and let us not by struggling with our chains make them straighter and heavier. For my part, I'll run the hazard of being thought anything rather than a rash inconsiderate man. And to tell you my thoughts without disguise, I am now so much in love with a retired life, that I am never like to be fond of making a bustle in the world again. I have much more to say, but the post cannot stay; and I refer the rest till meeting, being entirely

"Yours."

Monmouth's ill-concerted and ill-conducted expedition following, at no distant period, the prudent resolutions expressed in the above letter, places the instability of his character in a strong light.

C. Ross.—Vol. iv. p. 70.

The following small piece of tradition, of which I made a note many years ago, indicates that the adventurous but ill-advised duke was a man of unusual muscular power and activity.

"On the 8th of July, 1685, the Duke of Monmouth was brought a prisoner to Ringwood, and halted at an inn there. My mother, who was a native of Ringwood, used to relate, that her grandmother was one of the spectators when the royal prisoner came out to take horse; and that the old lady never failed to recount, how he rejected any assistance in mounting, though his arms were pinioned; but, placing his foot in the stirrup, sprang lightly into his saddle, to the admiration of all observers." ELIJAH WARING.

MARY STUART'S CHAIR.

On the south side of the chancel of Conington Church, Hunts., stands a handsome, massive, and elaborately carved oaken chair, which has been traditionally known as the very seat from which the unfortunate Mary Stuart rose to submit her neck to the executioner. The chair was probably brought from Fotheringay, and placed in Conington Church as a sacred relic, by Sir Robt. Cotton, who built Conington Castle partly with the material of Fotheringay, and who (according to Gough, in his additions to Camden's *Britannia*, vol. ii., "ICENI," ed. 1789) "brought from there *the whole room* where Mary Queen of Scots was beheaded." By this, perhaps, is meant, the deeply recessed arcade that now forms the two *exterior* sides of the ground-floor of Conington Castle; which arcade, doubtless, was on the *interior* walls of Fotheringay, the windows being above it: the principal window being supposed to be that which now forms the staircase window of the Talbot Inn, Oundle. Modern windows have been placed within the eleven divisions of the arcade at Conington Castle.

In speaking of Conington Church, Gough says (see *Additions to Camden*) that "Lord Coleraine saw a chair of an Abbot of Peterborough in this church, 1743," which must have been the chair now under notice. The nature of its decorations shows it to have been a chair used for religious purposes; and the six principal figures that adorn it, are made to face at right angles with the chair; so that when it was placed on the south side of the altar, the faces of the figures would be turned towards the east.

The top of the chair is battlemented, and flanked by the two side-pieces which terminate in pediments supporting figures. Both figures are seated on low chairs of a massive ecclesiastical character. The right-hand figure (which is headless) holds an open volume, and is apparelled in chasuble and alb. The left-hand figure is seated on a more highly decorated seat, wears a crown, and is bearded; is vested in chasuble, alb, and dalmatic; and, though the hands are deficient, evidently did not, like the other figure, bear an open volume. Both figures face to the east. The upper part of the back of the chair is filled in with a pointed arch, cusped, and highly ornamented; the arcs being divided into smaller cusps, which terminate (as do the larger) with leaves and trefoils carved with great richness. In the spandrels of the cusps are birds with outspread wings, bearing labels. Those on the left appear to be eagles; those on the right have long bills, and may be intended for pelicans. The large right-hand spandrel of the arch contains a figure of the Virgin Mary, crowned as "the Queen of Heaven," clad in long flowing drapery, with her hands upraised, apparently in benediction, and her hair loose and streaming. Near to her is her emblem, the pot of lilies; the pot being much decorated, the lilies five in number. It stands upon a label, whose folds fill up the rest of the spandrel. The left-hand large spandrel contains the figure of an angel feathered to the elbow and knee, his wings outspread, and a label proceeding from one hand. The arms of the chair are divided into two parts. The first part terminates in a graceful curve, supporting a

figure: the second part is continued with a curve carried on into the wings of a figure kneeling upon one knee: the intervals are filled up with open Gothic work. The four figures on the arms are all angels, whose wings are made to rest upon, or join into, the curved form of the chair-arm. They all face to the east, and are clad in loose drapery; the folds of which (as in the cases of the other figures) are carved with great minuteness, and disposed with much knowledge of artistic effect. The upper left-hand figure holds a trumpet; that on the right a stringed instrument, which neither resembles the Grecian, Roman, Jewish, nor Egyptian lyre, but has precisely the same form as the modern "banjo" of the negroes. Of the two angels on the lower divisions of the arm, the one on the right bears a legend, and the one on the left appears to have done the same, but the arms have been broken off. These legends may have been illuminated with texts of Scripture, &c. The sides of the chair are recessed, and filled in with a species of Gothic tracery that is apparently of later date than the rest. The front of the chair is panelled, and the foot is decorated with quatrefoils in high relief.

During the sleep of indifferentism which fell upon the church towards the close of the past century, all interest attaching to the chair seems to have been forgotten; and, after a lapse of years, it was discovered by the late Mr. Heathcote, of Conington Castle, in a room of the belfry of the church, where it had been thrust aside with other things as useless lumber, and daubed with the whitewash and paint of the generations of workmen who had cleansed their brushes on its broad surface. Mr. Heathcote, with a praiseworthy regard for a relic of so much interest, resolved to replace the chair in the position it had formerly occupied in the chancel of the church: but before this could be done, it was necessary to repair the ill usage which the chair had received, and to restore it, as much as possible, to its original condition. It was accordingly confided to trustworthy and skilful hands; the old ornamental portions were replaced, and the chair was in every way restored strictly

in accordance with its original design. It is now in a good state of repair, and will probably remain for many ages a mute memorial of that tragic scene in which it once played its part.

And, could we imagine the Dryad that watched over its forest-birth had filled its oaken frame with speech and feeling · or that a greater Power had put a voice into its shape, and caused the beam out of its timber to cry out against that cruel death-scene in the banquet-hall of Fotheringay, we might almost suppose it to have denounced the English Queen in the words of the Prophet Habakkuk (ii. 10, 11):

"Thou hast consulted shame to thy house by cutting off many people, and hast sinned against thy soul. For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it."

And, so long as that chair remains in the church of Conington, and the stones of the banquet-hall of Fotheringay form a portion of its castle, so long shall that cry go up to heaven, and tell the hapless doom of Mary Stuart!

CUTHBERT BEDE, B.A.—(vii. p. 197.)

CARDINAL WOLSEY.

In the life of Wolsey in the *Penny Cyclopædia* is the following: —

"It is said that while he lived at Lymington, he got drunk at a neighbouring fair. For some such cause it is certain that Sir Amias Paulett put him into the stocks,—a punishment for which we find that he subsequently revenged himself."

Collins, in his *Peerage of England*, vol. iv. p. 3, says,

"That in the reign of Henry VII., when Cardinal Wolsey was only a schoolmaster at Lymington, in Somersetshire, Sir Amias Paulett, for some misdemeanour committed by him, clapped him in the stocks; which the Cardinal, when he grew into favour with Henry VIII., so far resented, that he sought all manner of ways to give him trouble, and obliged him (as Godwin in his *Annals*, p. 28, observes) to dance attendance at London for some years, and by all manner of obsequiousness to curry favour with him. During the time of his attendance, being commanded by the Cardinal not to depart London without licence, he took up his lodging in the great gate of the Temple towards Fleet Street."

The following anecdote, taken from a common-place book of Sir Roger Wilbraham, who was Master of the Requests in the time of Queen Elizabeth, appears to have some bearing on this subject.

"Cooke, attorney, at diner Whitsunday* ista protulit.

"Wolsey, a prelate, was flagrante crimine taken in fornication by S^r^ Anthony Pagett of y^e^ West, and put in y^e^ stokes. After being made Cardinall, S^r^ Anthony sett up his armes on y^e^ middle Temple gate: y^e^ Cardinall passing in pontificalibus, and spying his owne armes, asked who sett them up. Answare was made y^t^ y^e^ said Mr. Pagett. He smiled saying, he is now well reclaymed; for wher before he saw him in disgrace, now he honoured him."—Vol. iv. p. 213.

ALLEGED BASTARDY OF ELIZABETH.

In the State Paper Office (*Dom. Pap.*, temp. Jac. I.), there is, under date of 1608, a letter from Mr. Chamberlaine to Sir Dudley Carleton, of October 28, in which Chamberlaine says:—

"I heare of a Bill put into the Exchequer, concerninge much lande that sh^d^ be alienated on account of the alleged bastardy of Queen Elizabeth."—Vol. vii. p. 528.

PORSENA, THE EIGHTH KING OF ROME.

The three following communications from Mr. E. West, appeared in the 12th vol., pp. 239. 360. 419.:—

The story of Porsena and his expedition against Rome has hitherto been one of the most inexplicable phenomena which occur in the early history of that city. On one point alone do modern historians appear to be agreed, namely, that the purport of his expedition cannot have been to restore the Tarquins; but on every thing else, what was its purport, and when he lived, the most opposite opinions have been given. Thus Ihne places him in the age of the elder Tarquin, while Niebuhr brings him down to a somewhat advanced period of the republic. I flatter myself that I have hit upon his real history, and this I now proceed to lay before your readers.

* This was probably in 1598.

A singular custom existed at Rome of offering at public sales the goods of *King* Porsena. Of what place, I ask, was Porsena king? Not of Etruria, for all accounts represent his power as confined to Clusium; and not of Clusium, for of that city he was lars. This being so, I know of no alternative than to set him down as king of Rome. This conjecture may seem somewhat startling, but it is strongly confirmed by a statement in Dionysius, according to which the Romans presented to Porsena an ivory throne, a golden crown, a sceptre, and other insignia of royalty; and by another in Livy (iii. 39), to the effect that under the leadership of the Valerii and Horatii the kings had been expelled. Now, it so happens that Livy mentions no Horatius in his account of the expulsion of the Tarquins, but he does introduce one (Cocles) as a most determined enemy of Porsena. From this it is evident that the writer from whom this passage is primarily derived, conceived Porsena to have been king of Rome. Moreover, it harmonises so exactly with what I shall show to be true history, that of its accuracy I do not feel the slightest doubt.

If so, how did Porsena come to be king of Rome?—by conquest? Or did he have any right to that dignity? I believe he had. Servius, the predecessor of Tarquin II., is said by one account to have been a companion of Cœlius, and to have been originally named Mastarna. "Companion of Cœlius" seems to point to his having been a Clusian, Cœlius being evidently only another form of Clus—the name of the Etruscan town deprived of its Latin termination; and Mastarna is simply the Celtic title Mactiern (son of the chief). Even admitting that the Etruscans were not Celts, Servius may easily have had a Celtic title, for the Gauls had been established in the neighbourhood of Clusium for a considerable time. On these grounds I conjecture Servius to have been the son of the then lars of Clusium.

We now see why Porsena led his expedition against Rome. Servius, to whom he was related, had been barbarously murdered by the Tarquinian family, one of whom

then usurped his throne. Porsena went to Rome to revenge the death of Servius and to put down the usurper. This supposition that Tarquin was expelled by Porsena, is certainly contradictory to the testimony of all antiquity; but this testimony was caused by a mistake in the name of the family which he intended to restore. Porsena came to Rome to reinstate, not the Tarquinian, but the Clusian family on the throne of Rome in his own person.

Porsena did not enjoy his kingdom any length of time. If he had, it would have been impossible for the fact of his having been king to have been so entirely unknown to the later Roman historians. Some of the Tarquins probably fled to Cumæ, where Aristodemus ruled, and persuaded him to make war upon Porsena, and the result was the defeat of Porsena's son, Aruns, before the walls of Aricia. The Romans took advantage of this to expel Porsena, and thus throw off all connexion with both the contending monarchs.

I will finish by making an application of our knowledge that Porsena was king of Rome to the illustration of the origin of the received account of the expulsion of the Tarquins. Porsena was, as I have shown, the real last king of Rome, but Tarquin was believed to have been so. Events which happened in the reign of Porsena were therefore attributed to the other, just as events which happened in the time of the real first dictator, Valerius, were attributed to the supposed first dictator, Larcius. This confusion, moreover, was favoured by the resemblance between the names Porsena and Tarquin,—a resemblance so great, that one modern author, at least, has not scrupled to identify the two monarchs. The account of the expulsion of the Tarquins is simply a second edition of the events which led to the expulsion of Porsena. That resulted from the conduct of his son Aruns, while besieging a Latin city, Aricia; so Tarquin's expulsion was said to have been caused by the conduct of his son (and his name is sometimes given as Aruns), and this while besieging a Latin city with a name resembling Aricia—Ardea. This latter story must be the false one, for we know, from the treaty with Carthage in the first year of the

republic, that Ardea was then subject to Rome. The story of Lucretia is of course a repetition of the story of Virginia.

I can back the theory laid down above by other arguments and evidence, which, for brevity's sake, I have abstained from bringing forward on the present occasion.

PORSENA AND THE CLUSIAN DYNASTY AT ROME.

I now place before the readers of "N. & Q." some observations tending further to confirm and illustrate my view that Rome was ruled by a Clusian dynasty adverse to the Tarquinian, of which dynasty Porsena was the second king.

According to the tradition followed by Livy and Dionysius, Servius, the first Clusian King of Rome, was of Latin origin, being born at Corniculum, and the son of a certain Ocrisia. This is contrary to the Etruscan, and no doubt the true account, which makes him an Etrurian, and I fancy I can show how it originated. There was a city called Ocriculum in the vicinity of Clusium, and Servius, who was a Clusian, was probably mentioned by some writer as connected with that place. We may hazard the conjecture that he was said to have been born there, although what that connexion was, cannot now with certainty be known. The historians of Rome split this into two, making of it that Servius was born at Corniculum, and that his mother's name was Ocrisia. This seems to be tolerably certain, for the two names, Ocrisia and Corniculum, are evidently formed from Ocriculum. Thus, although the Roman tradition seems at first sight to militate with my view, it may be not only reconciled to it, but made to supply something like a confirmation to its truth.

Now, as Servius was a Clusian, it may be asked, how came a Clusian to be king of Rome? The answer is easy. Dionysius represents a league of several Etrurian states as having been formed against Tarquinius Priscus. Clusium is mentioned as having been one, and it is generally believed that it was at that time at the head of the twelve states of Etruria. If so, it necessarily follows that a Clusian would have commanded the army of the league. I am convinced that Servius, the son of the lars of Clusium, was

the commander, and that he conquered Rome and made himself king. Just in the same way Sextus, the son of Tarquin II., reduced Gabii for his father, and was made king. This war of the Etrurians against Tarquin I., is an exact parallel to the war of Porsena against Tarquin II.

It is little more than following up the statements of our authorities to their natural consequence, when I transfer the expedition of Porsena to the time of Tarquin, instead of representing it as occurring after his expulsion. They always synchronise this war with the very beginning of the republic. Rome was certainly then as powerful as it was at the time when Livy believes that it would have successfully resisted Alexander if he had invaded Italy. The lars of Clusium must therefore have been for a long time (several years) engaged in preparing his expedition; it necessarily follows, then, that he was doing so while Tarquin was reigning without opposition at Rome. And for what purpose, if not to make war on the Tarquins? If we admit, as we must, that Porsena prepared for war with Rome while Tarquin was on the throne, why should he not have gone a step farther, and have made war with it at the same time?

But we are not reduced to have to support our proposition that Tarquin and Porsena were enemies by inferences only, for we have decisive evidence that they were so in Livy ii. 14. 21. 34. Aristodemus there appears as the staunch friend of Tarquin, and yet (for he commanded the Cumean auxiliaries, mentioned ii. 14.) gives that assistance to the Aricians which enabled them to defeat and kill the son of Porsena. Mamilius, the son-in-law of Tarquin, also assisted the Aricians in the same war. When we see Tarquin's best friends — they who hazarded their own position to reseat him on his father's throne — enemies of Porsena, who will say that they themselves were not enemies?

I will add a conjecture which, if just, will throw some farther light on this obscure subject. A certain Attus Clausus is said to have come to Rome with 5000 clients in the first year of the republic. Our authorities call him a Sabine, and the reason given for his emigration is, that he

disapproved of the conduct of his countrymen in making war with Rome. This war is now admitted on all hands to be unhistorical, and this derivation of the Claudian family falls of course to the ground with it. We must therefore bring Clausus from some other quarter, and I conjecture that he came to Rome with Porsena. His name Clausus certainly comes from Clusium (Clausus, Clusus, Clusius, Clusium), and the dates assigned for his emigration and the expedition of Porsena are identical. Supposing this conjecture tenable, and I believe it to be so, I would infer from it, that the Claudian tribe was a colony left by Porsena at Rome (of this colony Livy makes mention, ii. 14., though he erroneously, apparently misled by the name, places it in the Tuscan Street;) and that the two plethra which were given to each of the clients of Clausus, were a reward given by Porsena to his followers, after the war had been brought to a successful termination. This seems clear when we remember that Porsena is always said to have mulcted the Romans of a certain portion of their territory formerly belonging to Veii, and that it was there that Clausus and his clients received their land. This colony must have joined the Romans in their revolt from Porsena, probably to preserve their land. There are several instances in the early history of Rome, of its colonists taking part in the revolts of the nations among whom they were placed to keep them in subjection. Livy seems to allude to this revolt when he says (ii. 15.) that Porsena gave back to the Romans the Veientian land, which he had taken from them by the treaty at the Janiculum. This statement is incredible, if we do not take it to mean that the inhabitants of the Veientian land (*i. e.* the Clusian colony) broke off their allegiance to Porsena, and joined the Romans. The received account of these facts is absolutely impossible; according to which the Romans gave the two plethra each to the 5000 clients of Clausus out of their mere good pleasure, just at the time when a considerable part of their territory had been taken from them by the Etruscans. And still more so, if we may believe the story that Cocles was

rewarded for his defence of the bridge with as much land as he could plough in a day.

THE FOUR LAST KINGS OF ROME.

It is hazardous, as a rule, to deal with the chronology of such semi-mythical beings as the kings of Rome are. But the alteration in that chronology which I now make is of some importance, and is supported by so many concurrent circumstances, that the truth of it cannot be doubted. It is, that the reign of the elder Tarquin did not last more than one year at the most. Our authorities say that it lasted thirty-eight, and I ground my contrary opinion on the following circumstances:—First, the truce for 100 years, which Romulus granted to Veii just before his apotheosis (say in A. U. C. 37), does not, according to Livy (i. 42.), expire till 176. Then the remark in Livy, i. 18. (which, inasmuch as it is contrary to his own chronology, is certainly derived from some ancient book), according to which more than 100 years subsequent to Numa's accession (38), in the reign of Servius (this *commenced* in 176), Pythagoras assembled the youth of the remoter parts of Italy, &c. Farther, the sons of Ancus complain, in 176 (Livy, i. 40.), that within the space of a little more than 100 years from the time when Romulus was king (37), a slave (Servius) should sit on his throne. And lastly, the internal improbability, that the sons of Ancus, who were young men when Tarquin I. usurped the throne, should allow him to remain in undisputed possession of it for thirty-eight years, and then suddenly remember their own title to it and kill him. If we reject thirty-seven out of the thirty-eight years of Tarquin I.'s reign, all is clear: the truce with Veii expires at the proper period; the time between Numa's accession and Servius is exactly 100 years (Pythagoras, be it remembered, is not placed in the beginning of the reign of Servius); and the time between the reign of Romulus and Servius's accession, in the words of the sons of Ancus, a little more; and we escape the im-

possibility of the thirty-eight years of quietude of the latter parties. The events which really happened in the reign of Tarquin I. may easily have happened in the compass of a year; the others have been transferred to him from Tarquin II, and even from Porsena through his medium.

A word now on the history of Servius. Plutarch, without specifying which, says that Cæcilia was the wife of one of Tarquin's sons. Sir G. C. Lewis (*Cred. of the early History of Rome*) seems at a loss to tell which; and remarks that, according to the common account, the two sons of Priscus marry the two daughters of Servius, and that the three sons of Superbus were unmarried. He however has forgotten Servius (believed to have been the son-in-law of Priscus), and to him the passage in Plutarch, without doubt, refers. Servius was, therefore, the husband of Cæcilia; who, as is proved by her name*, was the daughter of Cæles (or Cælius, misprinted, p. 240., Cœlius). The history of Cæles is very obscure, but he was certainly a powerful chief. Here we see the origin and untrustworthiness of another story respecting Servius, which clashes with our view (the story that he was the son-in-law of Tarquin I.), viz. the Roman historians knew that Servius married the daughter of some powerful chief, and not knowing his name—or perhaps having heard of it, and yet not able to give it correctly, as they placed Cæles in the Romulian era—they set it down at once as Tarquin I.

It is almost unnecessary to point out the palpable inconsistencies in the received account of the accession of Servius to the throne of Rome. Tarquin I. had two sons, both of whom survived their father, of whom Superbus was one; and Servius was, even according to the received account, a foreigner. And yet the mother of the first (Ta-

* There can be no doubt that the very common termination to Roman proper names, *-ilius*, implies descent. It is in fact *filius*, the *f* being dropped in composition. Thus, Numa Pompilius is called the son of Pompo; Tullus Hostilius, the grandson of Hostus; Ofilius Calavius, the son of Ovius or Ofius (Livy, ix. 6.), &c. This upsets Hunc's derivation of Pompilius, Publilius, &c., from *Populus*.

naquil) is represented as plotting in favour of the second; quite regardless of the legitimate claims of her own offspring, who are not even mentioned. Such was the absurd story by which the Roman historians tried to conceal the fact of the entire conquest of Rome by the Clusian Servius.

To come now to the second Tarquin. One of the most important results of my system is, that it strikes out from history the whole account of the events which, according to our authorities, preceded his expulsion, as a mere repetition of those which really led to the expulsion of Porsena. The principal difference between the two narratives is, that the scene of the events in the first case is Ardea; and in the latter, Aricia. But this difference is not real, for it can be proved conclusively that Aricia and Ardea are merely different forms of the same word; and that the towns bearing those names are, in consequence, often confounded with each other. Aricia and Arsia are certainly identical*; and that Arsia and Ardea are so, is seen from the analogy of Clausus and Claudius. Farther, Turnus is in Virgil king of Ardea; and Turnus Herdonius is in Livy (i. 50.), chief of Aricia. Herdonius comes from Ardonius (Herdonea in Apulia, the scene of one of Hannibal's victories, is sometimes spelt Ardonea), as Herminius from Arminius; and it is evident that Ardonius and Ardea are cognate. When we remember these things, we can easily suppose that some writers spelt Aricia, the real scene of the defeat of Porsena's son, Ardea; and that when a duplicate was made and applied to Tarquin, the scene was in that instance given as Ardea, so as to keep some distinction between the two accounts. The difference before referred to in spelling

* This is clear, for the battle of Arsia (Livy, ii. 6, 7.) is certainly only a repetition of the battle of Aricia. Aruns Tarquinius is killed in the first, and Aruns Porsena in the second. The Cumæan auxiliaries also, which took part in the battle of Aricia, are sometimes transferred to the battle of Arsia, as by Plutarch. This repetition originated in the confusion which existed as to the name of the last king of Rome. Arsia is only mentioned in connexion with the battle fought there.

the name of the place where Aruns Porsena was defeated, perhaps originated the idea of these events being two and distinct.

I have said that Herminius comes from the German Arminius. This is the general opinion, and I mention it here because it helps to prove the Etruscan origin of the Herminian family. (Niebuhr has shown that the Etruscans were of German descent.) But this view does not need such doubtful support, for it is stated distinctly by Valerius Max.; Silius mentions an Etrurian named Herminius, and one Herminius has the Etruscan Lars or Larcius as his nomen (Livy, iii. 65.): see Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog., &c.* Thus the Herminian family was certainly Etruscan. No one ever doubted that the Larcian family had the same origin.

It is an important circumstance that a member of each of those families (Spurius Larcius, Titus Herminius) figured in the defence of the Sublician bridge against Porsena: for it shows us that the Roman enemies of Porsena were Etruscans like himself. This fact can be explained only in one way, and then all is clear and consistent; namely, by transferring the expedition of Porsena to the time of the Etruscan domination of Rome under Tarquin II., and by supposing his Etruscan opponents to have been men who upheld that dynasty in opposition to the Clusian.

I will now, in conclusion, answer an objection that may be made to my view, that Porsena was king of Rome. It is well known that in the historical period there stood in the capital seven statues, which were called the statues of the seven kings. This may seem hostile to my idea that the number of the kings of Rome was eight, but I do not think it is so. For is it probable that the Romans would, after they had expelled the tyrant Tarquin from Rome, allow his statue to remain in the capitol? It seems to me most improbable, particularly when I remember that when in the time of the empire a tyrant was slain, one of the first acts which followed was the throwing down of all the statues, &c., erected to him in the days of his prosperity.

WHERE WAS ANNE BOLEYN BURIED?

It is said in Miss Strickland's *Queens of England* (iv. 203.), that there is a tradition at Salle in Norfolk that the remains of Anne Boleyn were removed from the Tower, and interred at midnight, with the rites of Christian burial, in Salle Church, and that a plain black stone without any inscription is supposed to indicate the place where she was buried. An account of Salle Church, with the inscriptions on the Boleyn monuments, is given in the 4th volume of Blomefield's *Norfolk* (folio ed.), p. 421., but no allusion is made to any such tradition; and other parts of the same work, where the Boleyns (including the Queen) are referred to, are equally silent on the subject. Lord Herbert of Cherbury, in his *History of King Henry VIII.*, does not state how or where she was buried. Hollingshed, Stow, and Speed say, that her body, with the head, was buried in the choir of the chapel in the Tower; and Sandford, that she was buried in the chapel of St. Peter in the Tower.

Burnet (vol. i. p. 318.), who is followed by Henry, Hume, and Lingard, says that her body was thrown into a common chest of elm-tree that was made to put arrows in, and was buried in the chapel within the Tower, before twelve o'clock. Sharon Turner, in his *History of the Reign of King Henry VIII.*, vol. ii. p. 464., cites the following passage from Crispin's account of Anne Boleyn's execution, written fourteen days after her death, viz.:

"Her ladies immediately took up her head and the body. They seemed to be without souls, they were so languid and extremely weak; but fearing that their mistress might be handled unworthily by inhuman men, they forced themselves to do this duty; and though almost dead, at last carried off her dead body wrapt in a white covering."

In a letter in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October, 1815, signed "J.C.," it is said —

"But the headless remains of the departed Queen were said to be deposited in an arrow-chest, and buried in the Tower Chapel, before

the High Altar. Where that stood, the most sagacious antiquary, after a lapse of less than three hundred years, cannot now determine; nor is the circumstance, though related by eminent writers, clearly ascertained. In a cellar the body of a person of short stature, without a head, not many years since was found, and supposed to be the reliques of poor Anna; but soon after re-interred in the same place, and covered with earth."

The stone in Salle Church was some time since raised, but no remains were to be found underneath it. Miss S. states that a similar tradition is assigned to a black stone in the church at Thornden on the Hill: but Morant, in his *History of Essex*, does not notice it.—(vol. v. p. 464.)

WOLSEY'S SON.

The existence of a natural son of Cardinal Wolsey is a *fact* as well ascertained as any other *fact* of the Cardinal's history, and referred to in the various biographies of him that have appeared. His name was Thomas Winter. In Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary*, vol. xxiii. pp. 255. and 256. *note*, reference is made to a Bull of Pope Julius II., dated August, 1508, to be found in Kennet's MSS. in the British Museum, in which he is styled, "dilecti filio Thomæ Wulcy," Rector of Lymington, diocese of Bath and Wells, Master of Arts, "*pro dispensatione ad tertium incompatibile.*" This is explained by the passage in Wood's *Athenæ Oxon. Fasti*, part i. p. 73 (Bliss ed.), relating to him. "This Tho. Winter, who was nephew (or rather nat. son) to Cardinal Tho. Wolsey, had several dignities confer'd upon him before he was of age, by the means of the said Cardinal," viz. the archdeaconry of York, 1523; chancellorship of the church of Sarum; the deanery of Wells, 1525; the provostship of Beverly; and the archdeaconry of Richmond, &c.: on which there is a note by Baker, that "this Tho. Winter is said to have held of the church's goods clearly more than 2000 pds. per an." Wood adds, that about the time of the Cardinal's fall, he gave up all or most of his dignities, keeping only the archdeaconry of York, which he resigned also in 1540. In Grove's *Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey*, vol. iv. p. 31., among the "Articles" against the Cardinal, Article XXVII. expressly charges him, "that he took from his son Winter his income of 2,700*l.* a-year, applied it to his own use, and gave him only 200*l.* yearly to live on." A reference is made in Sir H. Ellis's *Letters Illustrative of English History*, 2nd Series, vol. ii. p. 70., to a letter of Edmund Harvel to Dr. Starkey, dated from Venice, April, 1535, in

which the writer expresses his obligations to Mr. Winter, for his "friendly mynde toward him," and begs him to return his thanks.

In Mr. Galt's *Life of Wolsey* (Appendix IV. p. 424. of Bogue's edition) will be found a copy of a letter from John Clusy to Cromwell, in relation to a natural daughter of Wolsey's in the nunnery of Shaftesbury.

The existence of a son of Cardinal Wolsey, is recorded in a letter from Eustace Chaupys to the Emperor Charles V., October 25, 1529, in the following words:—

"The cardinal has now retired with a very small train to a place about ten miles hence. A son of his has been sent for from Paris, who was there following his studies, and of whom I have formerly made some mention to your Majesty."—*Correspondence of Charles V.*, p. 291.

JAMES THE SECOND, HIS REMAINS.

Mr. Pitman Jones, in vol. ii. p. 243., writes as follows: The following curious account was given to me by Mr. Fitz-Simons, an Irish gentlemen, upwards of eighty years of age, with whom I became acquainted when resident with my family at Toulouse, in September, 1840; he resided in that city for many years as a teacher of the French and English languages, and had attended the late Sir William Follett in the former capacity there in 1817. He said,—

"I was a prisoner in Paris, in the convent of the English Benedictines in the Rue St. Jacques, during part of the revolution. In the year 1793 or 1794, the body of King James II. of England was in one of the chapels there, where it had been deposited some time, under the expectation that it would one day be sent to England for interment in Westminster Abbey. It had never been buried. The body was in a wooden coffin, inclosed in a leaden one; and that again inclosed in a second wooden one, covered with black velvet. That while I was so a prisoner, the sans-culottes broke open the coffins to get at the lead to cast into bullets. The body lay exposed nearly a whole day. It was swaddled like a mummy, bound tight with garters. The sans culottes took out the body, which had been embalmed. There was a strong smell of vinegar and camphor. The corpse was beautiful and perfect. The hands and nails were very

fine, I moved and bent every finger. I never saw so fine a set of teeth in my life. A young lady, a fellow-prisoner, wished much to have a tooth; I tried to get one out for her, but could not, they were so firmly fixed. The feet also were very beautiful. The face and cheeks were just as if he were alive. I rolled his eyes: the eyeballs were perfectly firm under my finger. The French and English prisoners gave money to the sans-culottes for showing the body. They said he was a good sans-culotte, and they were going to put him into a hole in the public churchyard like other sans-culottes; and he was carried away, but where the body was thrown I never heard. King George IV. tried all in his power to get tidings of the body, but could not. Around the chapel were several wax moulds of the face hung up, made probably at the time of the king's death, and the corpse was very like them. The body had been originally kept at the palace of St. Germain, from whence it was brought to the convent of the Benedictines. Mr. Porter, the prior, was a prisoner at the time in his own convent."

The above I took down from Mr. Fitz-Simons' own mouth, and read it to him, and he said it was perfectly correct. Sir W. Follett told me he thought Mr. Fitz-Simons was a runaway Vinegar Hill boy. He told me that he was a monk.

The following passage is transcribed from a communication relative to the Scotch College at Paris, made by the Rev. H. Longueville Jones to the *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, 1841, vol. vii. p. 33.: —

"The king left his brains to this college; and, it used to be said, other parts, but this is more doubtful, to the Irish and English colleges [at Paris]. His heart was bequeathed to the Dames de St. Marie at Chaillot, and his entrails were buried at St. Germain-en-Laye, where a handsome monument has been erected to his memory by order of George IV.; but the body itself was interred in the monastery of English Benedictine Monks that once existed in the Rue du Faubourg St. Jacques, close to the Val de Grace. In this latter house, previous to the Revolution, the following simple inscription marked where the monarch's body lay:—

'CI GIST JACQUES II. ROI DE LA GRANDE BRETAGNE.'"

A monument to the king still exists in the chapel of the Scotch College (which is now leased to a private school); and the inscription, in Latin, written by James, Duke of

Perth, is printed in the same volume of *Collectanea*, p. 35., followed by all the other inscriptions to James's adherents now remaining in that chapel.

In a subsequent communication respecting the Irish College at Paris, made by the same gentleman, and printed in the same volume, at p. 113. are these remarks :—

"It is not uninteresting to add, that the body of James II. was brought to this college after the destruction of the English Benedictine Monastery adjoining the Val de Grace; and remained for some years in a temporary tomb in one of the lecture halls, then used as a chapel. It was afterwards removed; by whose authority, and to what place, is not exactly known: but it is considered not improbable that it was transported to the church of St. Germain-en-Laye, and there buried under the monument erected by George IV. Some additional light will probably be thrown on this subject, in a work on the Stuarts now in course of compilation."

There is a marble monument erected in memory of James, in the chapel of the old Scotch College, in the Rue des Fossés Saint Victor. An urn of bronze, gilt, containing the king's brains, formerly stood on the crown of this monument. The urn was smashed, and the contents scattered over the ground, during the French Revolution. A much more important loss to posterity was incurred by the destruction of the manuscripts entrusted by James to the keeping of the brotherhood he loved. The trust is alluded to with mingled pride and affection in the noble and touching inscription on the Royal monument.—(vol. ii. p. 281.)

Dr. Wreford writes as follows: To the information which has recently been furnished in your pages respecting the remains of James II., it may be not uninteresting to add the inscription which is on his monument in the church of St. Germain-en-Laye.

The body of the king, or a considerable portion of it, which had remained unburied, was, I believe, interred at St. Germain soon after the termination of the war in 1814; but it being necessary to rebuild the church, the remains were exhumed and re-interred in 1824. Vicissitudes as strange in death as in life seem to have attended this unhappy king.

The following is the inscription *now* on his monument in the parish church of St. Germain :

"REGIO CINERI PIETAS REGIA.
"Ferale quisquis hoc monumentum suspicis
Rerum humanarum vices meditare.
Magnus in prosperis in adversis major
Jacobus 2. Anglorum Rex
Insignes ærumnas dolendaque nimium fata
Pio placidoque obitu exsolvit
in hâc urbe
Die 16. Septemb., anni 1701.
Et nobiliores quædam corporis ejus partes
Hic reconditæ asservantur."

Qui prius augustâ gestabat fronte coronam
Exiguâ nunc pulvereus requiescit in urnâ:
Quid solium — quid et alta juvant! terit omnia lethum,
Verum laus fidei ac morum haud peritura manebit,
Tu quoque summe Deus regem quem regius hospes
Infaustum excepit tecum regnare jubebis."

But a different inscription formerly was placed over the king's remains in this church, which has now disappeared ; at all events I could not discover it ; and I suppose that the foregoing was preferred and substituted for that, a copy of which I subjoin :

"D. O. M. Jussu Georgii IV. Magnæ Britanniæ &c., Regis, et curante Equite exc. Carolo Stuart Regis Britanniæ Legato, cæteris antea rite peractis et quo decet honore in stirpem Regiam hic nuper effossæ reconditæ sunt Reliquiæ Jacobi II., qui in secundo civitatis gradu clarus triumphis in primo infelicior, post varios fortunæ casus in spem melioris vitæ et beatæ resurrectionis hic quievit in Domino, anno MDCCI, v. idus Septemb., MDCCCXXIV."

At the foot of the monument were the words —

"Dépouilles mortelles de Jacques 2. Roi d'Angleterre."

A third monumental inscription to the memory of James II., in Latin, is to be seen in the chapel of the Scotch College in Paris. This memorial was erected in 1703, by James, Duke of Perth. An urn, containing the brains of

the king, formerly stood on the top of it. A copy of this inscription is preserved in the *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, vol. vii.—(vol. ii. p. 427.)

The subjoined copy of an authentic document, obtained through the kindness of Mr. Pickford, Her Majesty's consul in Paris, was communicated to "NOTES AND QUERIES," vol. iv. p. 498.

It is an "Extract from the Register of the Deliberation of the Municipal Council of St. Germain-en-Laye," dated July 12, 1824, containing the official report, or *procès-verbal*, of the discovery made that day of three boxes, in which were deposited a portion of the remains of King James II. and of the Princess Louise-Marie, his daughter.

The "annexes" referred to, of the respective dates of September 16 and 17, A.D. 1701, leave no doubt as to the disposal of the royal corpse at that time. With respect to its fate, after its removal from the English Benedictine convent in Paris in 1793, as mentioned in the article No. 46., it is most probable that it shared the fate of other royal relics exhumed at the same disastrous period from the vaults of St. Denis, which were scattered to the winds, or cast into a common pit.

It may be presumed that the epitaph given in the same document, and mentioned as being *such as had existed* in the church of St. Germain-en-Laye, had disappeared before the date of the "Extract from the Register." It probably was destroyed during the first fury of the French Revolution in 1793 :—

"République Française.
"Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité.

"Ville de Saint Germain-en-Laye.

"Extrait du Régistre des Délibérations du Conseil Municipal.

"Séance du 12 Juillet, 1824.

"Aujourd'hui lundi douze Juillet mil huit cent vingt-quatre, trois heures de relevée, nous Pierre Danès de Montardat, ancien Colonel

de Cavalerie, chevalier de l'ordre royal et militaire de St. Louis, Maire de la ville de St. Germain-en-Laye, ayant été informé par MM. les Architectes de la nouvelle église de cette ville, que ce matin, vers sept heures, en faisant la fouille de l'emplacement du nouveau clocher dans l'ancienne chapelle des fonds, on avait découvert successivement trois boites en plomb de différentes formes, placées très près les unes des autres, et dont l'une desquelles portait une inscription gravée sur une table d'étain, constatant qu'elle contient partie des restes du roi Jacques Stuart Second, Roi d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande. Nous sommes transporté sur le lieu susdésigné accompagné de M. le Comte Bozon de Talleyrand, Lieutenant Géneral honoraire, Grand' Croix de l'ordre de St. Louis, Gouverneur du Château de St. Germain-en-Laye, de M. Jean Jacques Collignon, curé de cette paroisse royale, de MM. Malpièce et Moutier, architectes de la nouvelle église, de M. Rigault, secrétaire de la Mairie, et de MM. Voisin, Perrin, Baudin, de Beaurepaire (le comte), Dusouchet, Galot, Decan, Dupuis, Jeulin, Journet, Griveau, Dufour, Delaval, Casse et Barbé, membres du Conseil Municipal, et de M. Morin, Commissaire de Police,

"Où étant, nous avons reconnu et constaté;

"1°. Que la première des trois boites susdites (figure A) était en plomb de 0m. 35c. carrés et 0m. 18 centimètres de hauteur, recouverte d'une plaque en même de 0m. 22 centimètres carrés, sous laquelle plaque on a trouvé une table en étain de 0m. 20 centimètres de haut, 0m. 15c. de large, portant cette inscription:—

> "'Ici est une portion de la chair et des parties nobles du corps de très haut, très puissant, très excellent Prince Jacques Stuart, second du nom, Roi de la Grande Bretagne; naquit le XXIII Octobre MDCXXXIII, décédé en France, à St. Germain-en-Laye, le XVI Septembre MDCCI.'

"Au bas de la plaque sont empreintes ses armes.

"Cette boite est en partie mutilée: elle contient plusieurs portions d'ossements et des restes non encore consommés.

"La deuxième boite (figure B) circulaire est aussi en plomb de 0m. 34 centimètres de diamètre et 0m. 30c. de hauteur et découverte.

"La troisième boite (figure C) de 0m. 30c. carrés et 0m. 25 centimètres de hauteur est aussi en plomb et fermée de toutes parts à l'exception d'un trou oxydé.

"Ces deux dernières boites ne paraissent contenir que des restes consommés. Ces trois boites ont été enlevées, en présence de toutes les personnes dénommées au présent, avec le plus grand soin et transportées dans le Trésor de la Sacristie.

"Ensuite nous avons fait faire aux archives de la Mairie les re-

cherches nécessaires, et nous avons trouvé sur le régistre de l'année 1701 à la date du 16 Septembre, les actes dont copies seront jointes au présent procès-verbal, ainsi que l'Epitaphe du Roi Jacques, et qui constatent que partie de ces entrailles, de son cerveau avec les poumons et un peu de sa chair, sont restés en dépôt dans cette église pour la consolation des peuples tant Français qu'Anglais, et pour conserver en ce lieu la mémoire d'un si grand et si religieux prince.

" Les autres boites sont sans doute les restes de la Princesse Louise-Marie d'Angleterre et fille du Roi Jacques Second, décédée à St. Germain le 17 Avril, 1712, ainsi que le constate le régistre de cette année, qui indique qu'une partie des entrailles de cette Princesse a été déposée près des restes de son père.

" De tout ce que dessus le présent a été rédigé les sus-dits jour, mois et an, et signé de toutes les personnes y dénommées.

" (Ainsi signé à la minute du procès-verbal.)

" Suivent les annexes.

" Du seize Septembre mil sept cent un, à trois heures et vingt minutes après midi, est décédé dans le château vieil de ce lieu, très haut, très puissant et très religieux Prince Jacques Stuart, second du nom, Roi d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande, âgé de 67 ans 11 mois, également regretté des peuples de France et d'Angleterre, et surtout des habitans de ce lieu et autres qui avaient été temoins oculaires de ses excellentes vertus et de sa religion, pour laquelle il avait quitté toutes ses couronnes, les cédant à un usurpateur dénaturé, ayant mieux aimé vivre en bon chrétien éloigné de ses états, et faire par ses infortunes et sa patience, triompher la réligion catholique, que de régner lui-même au milieu d'un peuple mutin et hérétique. Sa dernière maladie avait duré quinze jours, pendant lesquels il avait reçu deux fois le St. Viatique et l'extrême onction par les mains de Messire Jean François de Benoist, Docteur de la Maison de Sorbonne, prieur et curé de ce lieu, son propre pasteur, avec des sentimens d'une humilité profonde, qu'après avoir pardonné à tous les siens rebelles et ses plus cruels ennemis, il demanda même pardon à ses officiers, s'il leur avait donné quelque sujet de chagrin. Il avait donné aussi des marques de sa tendresse et religion au Sérénissime Prince de Galles, son fils, digne héritier de ses couronnes aussi bien que de ses vertus, auquel il recommanda de n'avoir jamais d'autre règle de sa conduite que les maximes de l'Evangile, d'honorer toujours sa très vertueuse mère, aux soins de laquelle il le laissait, de se souvenir des bontés que Sa Majesté très chrétienne lui avait toujours témoigné, et de plutôt renoncer à tous ses états que d'abandonner la foi de Jésus-Christ. Tout le peuple tant de ce lieu que des environs ont eu la consolation de lui rendre les derniers devoirs et de la visiter pour la dernière fois

en son lit de parade, où il demeura vingt-quatre heures exposé en vue, pendant lesquelles il fut assisté du clerge de cette église, des révérends pères Récollets et des Loges, qui ne cesseront pas de prier pour le repos de l'âme de cet illustre héros du nom chrétien que le Seigneur récompense d'une couronne éternelle.

"Signé, P. PARMENTIER, Secrétaire."

"Du dix-septième jour (même année) sur les huit heures et demie du soir, fut enlevé du château vieil de ce lieu, le corps de très haut, très puissant et religieux monarque Jacques Stuart, second du nom, Roi d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse et d'Irlande, après avoir été embaumé en la manière accoutumée, pour être conduit aux Religieux Bénédictins Anglais de Paris, faubourg St. Jacques, accompagné seulement de soixante gardes et trois carosses à la suite, ainsi qu'il avait ordonné pour donner encore après sa mort un exemple de détachement qu'il avait eu pendant sa vie des vanités du monde, n'étant assisté que de ses aumoniers et de Messire Jean François de Benoist, prêtre, Docteur de la Maison de Sorbonne, prieur et curé de ce lieu, son propre pasteur, qui ne l'avait point abandonné dans toute sa maladie, l'ayant consolé dans tous ses maux d'une manière édifiante et autant pleine d'onction qu'on puisse désirer du pasteur zélé pour le salut de ses ouailles. Son cœur fut en même tems porté dans l'Eglise des Religieuses de Chaillot; une partie de ses entrailles, de son cerveau, avec ses poumons et un peu de sa chair, sont restés en dépôt dans cette église, pour la consolation des peuples tant Français qu'Anglais et pour conserver en ce lieu la mémoire d'un si grand et si religieux prince.

"Signé, P. PARMENTIER, Secrétaire."

"Epitaphe de Jacques Second, Roi de la Grande Bretagne, telle qu'elle existait dans l'Eglise de St. Germain-en-Laye: —

'A. Regi Regum
felicique memoriæ
Jacobi II. Majoris Britanniæ Regis
Qui sua hic viscera condi voluit
Conditus ipse in visceribus Christi.
Fortitudine bellicâ nulli secundus,
Fide Christianâ cui non par?
Per alteram quid non ausus?
Propter alteram quid non passus?
Illâ plus quam heros
Istâ propè martyr.

Fide fortis
Accensus periculis, erectus adversis.

Nemo Rex magìs, cui regna quatuor
Anglia, Scotia, Hibernia — Ubi quartum?
Ipse sibi.
Tria eripi potuere
Quartum intactum mansit.
Priorum defensio, Exercitus qui defecerunt:
Postremi tutelæ, virtutes nunquam transfugæ.

Quin nec illa tria erepta omnino.
Instar Regnorum est Ludovicus hospes;
Sarcit amicitia talis tantæ sacrilegia perfidiæ,
Imperat adhuc qui sic exulat.

Moritur, ut vixit, fide plenus,
Eòque advolat quò fides ducit
Ubi nihil perfidia potest.

Non fletibus hic, canticis locus est.
Aut si flendum, flenda Anglia.'

"Pour copies conformes, Le Maire de St. Germain," &c.

The authenticity of the signature attested by Her Britannic Majesty's consul in Paris, Dec. 11. 1850.

LEICESTER AND THE REPUTED POISONERS OF HIS TIME.

At page 315. vol. ii. of D'Israeli's *Amenities of Literature*, London, 1840, is as follows:—

"We find strange persons in the Earl's household (Leicester). Salvador, the Italian chemist, a confidential counsellor, supposed to have departed from this world with many secrets, succeeded by Dr. Julio, who risked the promotion. We are told of the lady who had lost her hair and her nails; . . . of the Cardinal Chatillon, who, after being closeted with the Queen, returning to France never got beyond Canterbury; of the sending a casuist with a case of conscience to Walsingham, to satisfy that statesman of the moral expediency of ridding the state of the Queen of Scots by an Italian philtre."

"The lady who had lost her hair and her nails" was Lady Douglas, daughter of William Lord Howard of Effingham,

and widow of John Lord Sheffield. Leicester was married to her after the death of his first wife Anne, daughter and heir of Sir John Robsart, and had by her a son, the celebrated Sir Robert Dudley, whose legitimacy, owing to his father's disowning the marriage with Lady Sheffield, in order to wed Lady Essex, was afterwards the subject of so much contention. On the publication of this latter marriage, Lady Douglas, in order, it is said, to secure herself from any future practices, had, from a dread of being made away with by Leicester, united herself to Sir Edward Stafford, then ambassador in France. Full particulars of this double marriage will be found in Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire*.

The extract from D'Israeli's *Amenities of Literature* relates to charges against Leicester, which will be found at large in *Leicester's Commonwealth*, written by Parsons the Jesuit,—a work, however, which must be received with great caution, from the author's well-known enmity to the Earl of Leicester, and his hatred to the Puritans, who were protected by that nobleman's powerful influence.

This subject receives interesting illustration in the *Memoirs of Gervas Holles*, who at some length describes the seduction of Lady Sheffield, by Leicester, at Belvoir Castle, while attending the Queen on her Progress. A letter from the Earl to the lady of his love, contained the suspicious intimation—

"*That he had not been unmindful in removing that obstacle* which hindered the full fruition of their contentments: that he had endeavoured one expedient already which had failed, but he would lay another which he doubted not would hit more sure."

This letter the Lady Sheffield accidentally dropped from her pocket; and being picked up and given to the Lord Sheffield by his sister Holles, he read it with anger and amazement. That night he parted beds, and the next day houses; meditating in what manner he might take honourable and just revenge. Having resolved, he posted up to London to effect it: but the discovery had preceded him to the knowledge of Leicester, who finding a necessity

to be quick, bribed an Italian physician ("whose name," says Holles, "I have forgotten") in whom Lord Sheffield had great confidence, to poison him, which was immediately effected after his arrival in London. Leicester, after cohabiting with the Lady Sheffield for some time, married the widow of the Earl of Essex, who it is thought, says Holles, "*served him in his own kind, every way.*"

In the suit afterwards instituted by Sir Robert Dudley, with the view of establishing his legitimacy, the Lady Sheffield was examined, and swore to a private marriage with the Earl of Leicester, but that she had been prevailed on, by threats and pecuniary largesses, to deny the marriage, as Queen Elizabeth was desirous that Lord Leicester should marry the widow of the Earl of Essex.

PERIPLUS OF HANNO THE CARTHAGINIAN.

Mr. R. T. Hampson writes as follows: — I am not sufficiently Quixotic to attempt a defence of the Carthaginians on the western coast of Africa, or any where else, but I submit that the accusation brought against them by Mr. S. Bannister, formerly Attorney-General of New South Wales, is not sustained by the only record we possess of Hanno's colonising expedition. That gentleman, in his learned *Records of British Enterprise beyond Sea*, says, in a note, p. xlvii.: —

"The first nomade tribe they reached was friendly, and furnished Hanno with *interpreters*. At length they discovered a nation *whose language was unknown to the interpreters*. These strangers they attempted to seize; and, upon their resistance, they took three of the women, whom they put to death, and carried their skins to Carthage." (*Geogr. Græci Minores*, Paris, 1826, p. 115.)

Hanno obtained interpreters from a people who dwelt on the banks of a large river, called the Lixus, and supposed to be the modern St. Cyprian. Having sailed thence for several days, and touched at different places, planting a colony in one of them, he came to a mountainous country inhabited by savages, who wore skins of wild beasts, δέρματα

Σήρεια ἐνημμένων. At a distance of twelve days' sail, he came to some Ethiopians, who could not endure the Carthaginians, and who spoke unintelligibly even to the Lixite interpreters. These are the people whose women, Mr. Bannister says, they killed. Hanno sailed from this inhospitable coast fifteen days, and came to a gulf which he calls Νότου Κέρα, or South Horn.

"Here," says the Dr. Hawkesworth of Carthage, "in the gulf, was an island, like the former, containing a lake, and in this another island, full of wild men; but the women were much more numerous, *with hairy bodies* (δασεῖαι τοῖς σώμασιν), whom the interpreters called γορίλλας. We pursued the men, who, flying to the precipices, defended themselves with stones, and could not be taken. Three women, who bit and scratched their leaders, would not follow them. Having killed them, we brought their skins to Carthage."

He does not so much as intimate that the creatures who so defended themselves with stones, or those whose bodies were covered with hair, spoke any language. Nothing but the words ἄνθρωποι ἄγριοι and γυναῖκες can lead us to believe that they were human beings at all; while the description of the behaviour of the men, and the bodies of the women, is not repugnant to the supposition that they were large apes, baboons, or or orang-outangs, common to this part of Africa. At all events, the voyagers do not say that they flayed a people having the faculty of speech.

It is not, however, improbable that the Carthaginians were severe taskmasters of the people whom they subdued. Such I understand those to have been who opened the British tin mines, and who, according to Diodorus Siculus, excessively overworked the wretches who toiled for them, "wasting their bodies underground, and dying, many a one, through extremity of suffering, while others perished under the lashes of the overseers." (*Bibl. Hist.* l. v. c. 38.) — (i. p. 361.)

This note led to the following from Mr. S. W. Singer: — "Mr. Hampson" has served the cause of truth in defending Hanno and the Carthaginians from the charge of cruelty, brought against them by Mr. Attorney-General

Bannister. A very slender investigation of the bearings of the narration would have prevented it. I know not how Dr. Falconer deals with it, not having his little volume at hand; but in so common a book as the *History of Maritime Discovery*, which forms part of Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopædia*, it is stated that these *Gorillæ* were "probably some species of *ourang-outang*." Purchas says they might be the *baboons* or *Pongos* of those parts.

The amusing, and always interesting, Italian, Hakluyt, in the middle of the sixteenth century, gives a very good version of the ΑΝΝΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΠΛΟΥΣ, with a preliminary discourse, which would also have undeceived Mr. Bannister, had he been acquainted with it, and prevented Mr. Hampson's pleasant exposure of his error.

Ramusio says, "Seeing that in the Voyage of Hanno there are many parts worthy of considerate attention, I have judged that it would be highly gratifying to the studious if I were here to write down a few extracts from certain memoranda which I formerly noted on hearing a respectable Portuguese pilot, in frequent conversations with the Count Raimondo della Torre, at Venice, illustrate this Voyage of Hanno, when read to him, from his own experience." There are, of course, some erroneous notions in the information of the pilot, and in the deductions made from it by Ramusio; but the former had the sagacity to see the truth respecting this *Gorgon Island full of hairy men and women*. I will not spoil the *naïveté* of the narration by attempting a translation; merely premising that he judged the Island to be that of Fernando Po.

"E tutta la descrittione de questo Capitano era simile a quella per alcun Scrittore Greci, quale parlande dell' isola delle Gorgone, dicono quella esser un isola in mezzo d' una palude. E conciacosa che havea inteso che li poeti dicevan le Gorgone esser femine terribili, però scrisse che le erano pelose. . . . Ma a detto pilotto pareva più verisimile di pensare, che havendo Hannone inteso ne' i libri de' poeti come Perseo era stato per aere a questa isola, e di quivi reportata la testa di Medusa, essendo egli ambitioso di far creder al mondo che lui vi fosse andato per mare; e dar riputation a questo suo viaggio, di esser penetruto fino dove era stato Perseo; volesse portar due pelli

di Gorgone, e dedicarle nel tempio di Giunone. Il che lui fu facil cosa da fare, conciosiacosa che IN TUTTA QUELLA COSTA SI TRUOVINO INFINITE DI QUELLE SIMIE GRANDE, CHE PARONO PERSONE HUMANE, DELLE BABUINE, le pelle delle quali poteva far egli credere ad ognuno che fossero state di femine."

Gosselin, also, in his *Recherches sur la Géographie des Anciens*, speaking of this part of Hanno's voyage, says: —

"Hanno encountered a troop of *Ourang-Outangs*, which he took for savages, because these animals walk erect, often having a staff in their hands to support themselves, as well as for attack or defence; and they throw stones when they are pursued. They are the Satyrs and the Argipani with which Pliny says Atlas was peopled. It would be useless to say more on this subject, as it is avowed *by all the modern commentators of the Periplus.*"

The relation we have is evidently only an abridgment or summary made by some Greek, studious of Carthaginian affairs, long subsequent to the time of Hanno; and judging from a passage in Pliny (l. ii. c. 67.), it appears that the ancients were acquainted with other extracts from the original, yet, though its authenticity has been doubted by Strabo and others, there seems to be little reason to question that it is a correct *outline* of the voyage. That the Carthaginians were oppressors of the people they subjugated may be probable; yet we must not, on such slender grounds as this narration affords, presume that they would wantonly kill and flay *human beings* to possess themselves of their skins!

THE LAST OF THE VILLAINS.

It would be an interesting fact if we could ascertain the last bondsman by blood — *nativus de sanguine* — who lived in this country. The beginning of the seventeenth century is the period usually referred to as the date of the extinction of personal villenage. In the celebrated argument in the case of the negro Somerset (*State Trials*, vol. xx. p. 41.), an instance as late as 1617—18 is cited as the latest in our law books. (See Noy's *Reports*, p. 27.) It is pro-

bably the latest recorded *claim*, but it is observable that the claim failed, and that the supposed villain was adjudged to be a free man. I can supply the names of three who were living near Brighton in the year 1617, and whose thraldom does not appear to have been disputed. Norden, from whose unpublished *Survey of certain Crown Manors* I have extracted the following notice, adverts to the fact, but seems to think that the times were rather unfavourable to any attempt by the lord of the manor to put his rights in force.

"There are three bondmen of blonde belonginge unto this manor, never known to be anie way mannumissed, namely, Thomas Goringe, William and John Goringe. Thomas Goringe dwells at Amberley, William at Piddinghow, and John Goringe at Rottingdean. What goods they have the Jurie know not. All poor men. Thomas hath the reversion of a cotage now in the tenure of William Jefferye. But mee thinkes this kinde of advantage is nowe out of season; yet, were they men of ability, they might be, upon some consideration, infraunchized." (*Survey of the Manor of Fulmer, Sussex.*)—(vol. i. p. 139.)

E. SMIRKE.

H. C. not having seen Mr. Smirke's communication, writes as follows:—Can any of your readers inform me at what period villenage became extinct in this kingdom? I have now before me a grant of a manor from the Crown, in the third and fourth year of the reigns of King Philip and Queen Mary, conveying, amongst other goods and chattels, the bondmen, bondwomen, and villeins, with their sequels, —"Nativos, nativas, e villanos cum eos sequelis." According to Blackstone, the children of villeins were in the same state of bondage with their parents; whence they were called, in Latin, "nativi," which gave rise to the female appellation of a villein, who was called a *neife*. What I wish to learn is, whether the old wording of Crown grants had survived the existence of villenage; or whether bondage was a reality in the reign of Philip and Mary; and if so, at what time it became extinct?—(vol. ii. p. 327.)

This query led to the following replies:—Your correspondent H. C. wishes to know whether bondage was a

reality in the time of Philip and Mary; and, if so, when it became extinct. It was a reality much later than that, as several cases in the books will show. Dyer, who was appointed Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in 1559, settled several in which man claimed property in his fellow man, hearing arguments and giving judgment on the point whether one should be a "villein regardant" or a "villein in gross." Lord Campbell, in his *Lives of the Chief Justices*, gives the following, tried before Dyer, *C. J.*:

"A. B., seised in fee of a manor to which a villein was regardant, made a feoffment of one acre of the manor by these words: 'I have given one acre, &c., and further I have given and granted, &c., John S., my villein.' Question, 'Does the villein pass to the grantee as a villein in gross, or as a villein appendant to that acre?' The Court being equally divided in opinion, no judgment seems to have been given." — *Dyer*, 48 b. pl. 2.

Another action was brought before him under these circumstances: — Butler, lord of the manor of Badmington, in the county of Gloucester, contending that Crouch was his villein regardant, entered into certain lands, which Crouch had purchased in Somersetshire, and leased them to Fleyer. Crouch thereupon disseised Fleyer, who brought his action against Crouch, pleading that Butler and his ancestors were seised of Crouch and his ancestors as of villeins regardant, from time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. The jury found that Butler and his ancestors were seised of Crouch and his ancestors until the first year of the reign of Henry VII.; but confessing themselves ignorant whether in point of law such seisin be an actual seisin of the defendant, prayed the opinion of the Court thereon. Dyer, *C. J.*, and the other judges agreed upon this to a verdict for the defendant for "the lord having let an hundred years pass without redeeming the villein or his issue, cannot, after that, claim them." (*Dyer*, 266. pl. 11.)

When Holt was Chief Justice of the King's Bench, an action was tried before him to recover the price of a slave who had been sold in Virginia. The verdict went for the

plaintiff. In deciding upon a motion made in arrest of judgment, Holt, *C. J.*, said, — "As soon as a negro comes into England he is free: one may be a villein in England, but not a slave." (*Cases temp. Holt*, 405.)

As to the period at which villenage in England became extinct, we find in *Litt.* (sec. 185.): —

"Villenage is supposed to have finally disappeared in the reign of James I., but there is great difficulty in saying when it ceased to be lawful, for there has been no statute to abolish it; and by the old law, if any freeman acknowledged himself in a court of record to be a villein, he and all his after-born issue and their descendants were villeins."

Even so late as the middle of the eighteenth century, when the great Lord Mansfield adorned the bench, it was pleaded "that villenage, or slavery, had been permitted in England by the common law; that no statute had ever passed to abolish this "*status;*" and that "although *de facto* villenage by birth had ceased, a man might still make himself a villein by acknowledgment in a court of record." This was in the celebrated case of the negro Somerset, in which Lord Mansfield first established that "the air of England had long been too pure for a slave." In his judgment he says,—

". . . . . Then what ground is there for saying that the *status* of slavery is now recognised by the law of England? . . . . At any rate, villenage has ceased in England, and it cannot be revived." — *St. Tr.*, vol. xx. pp. 1—82.

And Lord Macaulay, in his admirable *History of England*, speaking of the gradual and silent extinction of villenage, then, towards the close of the Tudor period, fast approaching completion, says: —

"Some faint traces of the institution of villenage were detected by the curious as late as the days of the Stuarts; nor has that institution ever to this hour been abolished by statute."

Tee Bee.

In Burton's *Leicestershire* (published in 1622), some curious remarks occur on this subject. Burton says, under

the head of "Houghton-on-the-Hill," that the last case he could find in print, concerning the claim to a villein, was in Mich. 9 & 10 Eliz. (*Dyer*, 266. b.), where one Butler, Lord of the Manor of Badminton in Gloucestershire, did claim one Crouch for his villein regardant to his said manor, and made an entry upon Crouch's lands in Somersetshire. Upon an answer made by Crouch, an *ejectione firmæ* was brought in the King's Bench; and upon the evidence it was moved, that as no seizure of the body had been made, or claim set up by the lord, for sixty years preceding, none could then be made. The Court held, in accordance with this, that no seizure could be made.—(vol. iii. p. 410.)

JAYTEE.

The slavery which existed in England under the Saxons, and which was not entirely obliterated till the beginning of the seventeenth century, was more properly called *villenage*. It was, as Blackstone observes:

"A species of tenure neither strictly feudal, Norman, nor Saxon, but mixed and compounded of them all."

This villenage is so graphically described by Blackstone, in his *Commentaries*, that I will quote a few passages.

"Under the Saxon government there were, as Sir William Temple speaks, a sort of people in a condition of downright servitude, used and employed in the most servile works; and belonging, both they, their children and effects, to the lord of the soil, like the rest of the cattle or stock upon it."—Vol. ii. book ii. c. 6.

"These villeins, belonging principally to lords of manors, were either villeins *regardant*, i. e. annexed to the manor or land; or else they were *in gross*, or at large, i. e. annexed to the person of the lord, and transferable by deed from one owner to another. They could not leave their lord without his permission; but if they ran away, or were purloined from him, might be claimed and recovered by action, like beasts or other chattels. They held, indeed, small portions of land, by way of sustaining themselves and their families; but it was at the mere will of the lord, who might dispossess them whenever he pleased; and it was upon villein services, that is, to carry out dung, to hedge and ditch the lord's demesnes, and any other the meanest offices. A villein, in short, was in much the same

state with us as Lord Molesworth describes to be that of the boors in Denmark, and which Stiernhook attributes also to the *traals* or slaves in Sweden." — Cap. 6.

The state of servitude of these villeins was not absolute, like that of the negroes in the West Indies; for as Hallam (*Middle Ages*, vol. i. p. 149.) observes:

"It was only in respect of his lord, that the villein, at least in England, was without rights; he might inherit, purchase, sue in the courts of law; though, as defendant in a real action or suit, wherein land was claimed, he might shelter himself under the plea of villenage."

Serfage ceased in the reign of Elizabeth. There were, however, some solitary instances later: the last instance of villenage is recorded in the reign of James I. Much valuable information on this interesting subject will be found in Blackstone's *Commentaries* (vol. ii. book ii. c. 6.), and in Hallam's *Middle Ages* (vol. i. p. 145., and vol. ii. p. 302., 9th edit., 1846).—(vol. x. p. 39.) F. M. Middleton.

MANUMISSION OF VILLEINS.

The following curious extract from an ancient MS. now in the possession of Sir Thomas Phillips, Bart., of Broadway, contrasts strangely with the views of liberté, égalité, &c., of the nineteenth century.

"Nota admissioni primo dominus dabit corpus sui villani aliqui libero per chartam suam cum tota sequela et omnibus, suis catallis deinde ille liber donatarius dabit illum nativum tanquum manumissum. Et a curia sui primi Domini, per capillos dicti manumissi, extra faciet deinde primus dominus dabit dicto manumissi, suam terram quam primus tenuit in villenagio libere pro certo servitio militari seu soccagio pro ut sibi placuerit et hoc per suam chartam." —(vol. vi. p. 268.) J. Noake.

THE ORKNEY ISLANDS IN PAWN.

Dr. Clarke mentions a curious circumstance, which was related to him in Norway, by Bernard Anker, of Christiania. He said that Great Britain had the Orkney Islands only in

pawn. Looking over some old deeds and records, belonging to the Danish crown, at Copenhagen, Mr. Auker found that these islands were consigned to England, in lieu of a dowry for a Danish princess, married to one of our English kings, upon condition that these islands should be restored to Denmark whenever the debt for which they were pledged should be discharged. Therefore, as the price of land, and the value of money, have undergone such considerable alteration since this period, it is in the power of Denmark, for a very small sum, to claim possession of the Orkneys.—(vol. vii. p. 105.) KIRKWALLENSIS.

The above note led to the following communications on the same subject:—

It gives me much pleasure to be enabled to inform your correspondent KIRKWALLENSIS that there is no fear of our losing these islands in the manner suggested by him, they having been renounced by Denmark nearly four hundred years ago, as will be seen from the following sketch.

The Orkneys were taken from the Picts about A.D. 838, by Kenneth II., king of Scotland, to which kingdom they were attached until 1099, when Donald VIII., surnamed Bane, brother of Malcolm Canmore, usurped the crown, to the prejudice of his nephews Edgar, Alexander, and David; and requiring assistance to maintain his position, he applied to Magnus, king of Norway, to whom, says Skene, "for help and supply he gave all the isles of Scotland (Camden says the Orkneys only), where, through and for other causes, many bloody battles were fought, until the battle of Larges, 3rd August, 1260, in the time of Alexander III. of Scotland, and Acho, king of Norway." The Scots proving victorious, Magnus of Norway, son and successor of Acho, made peace with Alexander, and renounced and discharged all right and title which he or his successors had, or might have or pretend, to the isles of Scotland, the king of Scotland paying therefore yearly to the said Magnus and his successors one hundred marks of sterling money. This contract was confirmed in 1312 by Haquin V. of Norway and Robert I. of Scot-

land. In 1426 Eric X. of Denmark renewed with James I. of Scotland these ancient treaties, particularly with regard to the Western Isles: the pension or annuity having been long omitted to be paid, Eric now freely gave it up to James; and thus, in appearance, the Orkneys were finally confirmed to Scotland; but virtually it was not so until 1468, when, says Skene, "at last the said annual, with all the arrearages and by-runs thereof, was discharged and renounced *simpliciter*, in the contract of marriage between King James III. and Margaret, daughter of Christian I., king of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, on the 8th of September, 1468; which discharge is not only ratified, but renewed thereafter by the said king, on the 12th May, 1469. It appears that James III., on the 24th February, 1483, commanded his ambassador sent to the Pope to desire a confirmation of the said perpetual renunciation and discharge of the contribution of the Isles."

According to Dr. Wallace's account (1700), King Christian agreed that the isles of Orkney and Zetland should remain in the possession of King James and his successors, as the Princess Margaret's dower, until either King Christian or his successors should pay to King James or his successors the sum of fifty thousand florins of the Rhine; but in the year following, hearing of his daughter's delivery of a prince at Edinburgh, he "for joy thereof renounced for ever to the crown of Scotland all right or claim to the said isles."

BROCTUNA.

KIRKWALLENSIS seems to have been led into an error respecting the Orkneys. It is true that Orkney and Shetland belonged to the crown of Norway, to which the Scottish family of St. Clair, or Sinclair, rendered military service for the earldom. It was not, however, to an English king, but to James III. of Scotland that Christian gave the hand of "the Maid of Norway." In the marriage preliminaries the latter thus stipulates respecting the dower: —"Rex credit sexaginta aureorum Rhenensium [florenorum] millia, ejus summæ priusquam è Danæ regno sponsa digrediatur numeraturus aureorum decem millia, quod verò

reliquum esset supplerent insulæ regni Norvegici, jam memoratæ, *Orcades*, una cum jurisdictione ac cæteris eodem pertinentibus, hac tamen lege, ut insulas eas, eousque teneat Scotiæ Rex sub firma *hypotheca* donec vel ipse, vel ejus heredes, Daniæ ac Norvegiæ Reges, æqua vicissim portione easdem redimant." This article was afterwards embodied in the marriage contract:—"Et terræ insularum Orchaden Regi nostro Jacobo *impignoratæ*, *ad Norvegiæ reges revertentur*, &c. Both documents are preserved in Torfæus (*Orcades*, pp. 188—191.). Mr. Auker's discovery of the original is, however, an interesting circumstance, as it would seem that the marriage in question was but the result of an attempt to settle amicably an ancient dispute respecting the sovereignty of the Hebrides—"vetus controversia de Hæbudis et Mannia magnis utriusque populi cladibus agitata"—which the king of France, as umpire, had been unable to pronounce upon, in consequence of the loss or concealment of the original instruments.—(vol. vii. p. 183.) W. G. A.

That the Orkney and Zetland Islands were transferred by Denmark to Scotland in 1468, in pledge for payment of part of the dower of the Princess of Denmark, who was married to James III., king of Scotland, under right of redemption by Denmark, is an admitted historic fact; but it is asserted by the Scottish, and denied by the Danish historians, that Denmark renounced her right of redemption of these islands. The question is fully discussed, with references to every work and passage treating of the matter, in the first introductory note to the edition of *The General Grievances and Oppressions of the Isles of Orkney and Shetland*, published at Edinburgh, 1836. And the writer of the note is led to the conclusion that there was no renunciation, and that Denmark still retains her right of redemption. Mr. Samuel Laing, in his *Journal of a Residence in Norway*, remarks, that the object of Torfæus' historical work, *Orcades, seu Rerum Orcadensium Historiæ libri tres*, compiled by the express command of Christian V., king of Denmark, was to vindicate the right of the Danish monarch

to redeem the mortgage of the sovereignty of these islands; and he adds, that in 1804, Bonaparte, in a proclamation addressed to the army assembled at Boulogne for the invasion of England, descanted on the claim of Denmark to this portion of the British dominions. In a note he has the farther statement, that in 1549 an assessment for paying off the sum for which Orkney and Zetland were pledged was levied in Norway by Christian III. (*Vide* Laing's *Norway*, 1837, pp. 352, 353.) From the preceding notice, it would appear, that Denmark never renounced her right of redemption, now merely a matter of antiquarian curiosity. And it is pertinent to mention, that the connexion of Orkney and Zetland was with Norway, not Denmark. I observe in the Catalogue of MSS., in the Cottonian Library in the British Museum (Titus C. VII. art. 71. f. 134.), "Notes on King of Denmark's Demand of the Orcades, 1587—8," which may throw some light on the matter.

In the historical sketch given by Broctuna, Kenneth II., king of Scotland, is said to have taken the Orkneys from the Picts A. D. 838; and that they remained attached to that kingdom till 1099, when Donald Bain, in recompense of aid given him by Magnus, king of Norway, gifted all the Scotch isles, including the Orkneys, to Norway. This is not what is understood to be the history of Orkney.

In the middle of the ninth century, Harold Harfager, one of the reguli of Norway, subdued the other petty rulers, and made himself king of the whole country. The defeated party fled to Orkney, and other islands of the west; whence, betaking themselves to piracy, they returned to ravage the coast of Norway. Harold pursued them to their places of refuge, and conquered and colonised Orkney about A. D. 875. The Norwegians at that time destroyed or expelled the race then inhabiting these islands. They are supposed to have been Picts, and to have received Christianity at an earlier date, but it is doubtful if there were Christians in Orkney at that period; however, Depping says expressly, that Earl Segurd, the second Norwegian earl, expelled the Christians from these isles. I may remark, that the names

of places in Orkney and Zetland are Norse, and bear descriptive and applicable meanings in that tongue; but hesitate to extend these names beyond the Norwegian colonisation, and to connect them with the Picts or other earlier inhabitants. No argument can be founded on the rude and miserable subterraneous buildings called Picts' houses, which, if they ever were habitations, or anything else than places of refuge, must have belonged to a people in a very low grade of civilisation. Be this as it may, Orkney and Zetland remained under the Norwegian dominion from the time of Harold Harfager till they were transferred to Scotland by the marriage treaty in 1468, a period of about six hundred years. What cannot easily be accounted for, is the discovery of two Orkney and Zetland deeds of the beginning of the fifteenth century, prior to the transfer, written not in Norse, but in the Scottish language.—(vii. p. 112.)

R. W.

W. H. F., having examined the MS. in the Cottonian Library in the British Museum (Titus C. VII. art 71. f. 134.), "Notes on King of Denmark's Demand of the Orcades," forwarded to NOTES AND QUERIES a copy of the only note he observed on this matter:

"Orcades, 1587.

"Frederik, King of Denmark, told Daniell Rogers that the King of Scotts dallied with him, and that he had not answered him to make restitucion of the Orcades when he sewed for his daughter Anne to be his wife; neither kept promise in shewing suche tres (lettres) as he pretended to have from the King of Denmarke, by which it should appear that he weare released from the contract by wch his predecessors were bound at all tymes to be ready uppon the receipt of one hundred thousand gilders, to restore the Orcades unto the kingdome of Denmarke againe, wch he must needs have agayne, for that the state of his kingdome had putt him in mynde of his oath, wch he had made when he was contracted."

It is almost unnecessary to add that the King of Scots was James VI. of Scotland, first of England, married to the Princess Anne of Denmark.—(xii. p. 254.)

RIOTS OF LONDON.

The following correspondence on this subject appeared in the 2nd Volume of "NOTES AND QUERIES": —

Seventy years having passed away since the riots of London, there cannot be many living who remember them, and still fewer who were personally in contact with the tumultuous throng. Under such circumstances, I venture to offer for introduction into your useful and entertaining miscellany some incidents connected with that event in which I was either personally an actor or spectator — things not in themselves important, yet which may be to some of your readers acceptable and interesting as records of bygone days.

The events of 1780, in themselves so terrific, were well adapted to be written indelibly on the memory of a young and ardent boy. At any age they would have been engraved as with an iron pen; but their occurrence at the first age of my early boyhood, when no previous event had claimed particular attention, fixed them as a lasting memorial.

The awful conflagrations had not taken place when I arrived in London from a large school in one of the midland counties in England, for the Midsummer vacation. So many of my school-fellows resided in the metropolis, or in a part of the country requiring a passage through London, that three or four closely packed post-chaises were necessary; and to accomplish the journey in good time for the youngsters to be met by their friends, the journey was begun as near to four o'clock A. M. as was possible.

The chaises, well crowned with boxes, and filled with joyous youth, were received at the Castle and Falcon, then kept by a Mr. Dupont, a celebrated wine merchant, and the friend of our estimable tutor. The whole of my schoolmates had been met by their respective friends, and my brother and I alone remained at the inn, when at length my mother arrived in a hackney-coach to fetch us, and from her we learned that the streets were so crowded that

she could hardly make her way to us. No time was lost, and we were soon on our way homewards. We passed through Newgate Street and the Old Bailey without interruption or delay; but when we came into Ludgate Hill the case was far different; the street was full and the people noisy, permitting no carriage to pass unless the coachman took off his hat and acknowledged his respect for them and the object for which they had congregated. "Hat off, coachee!" was their cry. Our coachman would not obey their noisy calls, and there we were fixed. Long might we have remained in that unpleasant predicament had not my foreseeing parent sagaciously provided herself with a piece of ribbon of the popular colour, which she used to good effect by making it up into a bow with a long streamer and pinning it to a white handkerchief, which she courageously flourished out of the window of the hackney-coach. Huzzas and "Go on, coachee!" were shouted from the crowd; and with no other obstruction than the full streets presented, we reached Beaufort Buildings, in the Strand, the street in which we resided.

There a new scene presented itself, which was very impressive to our young minds. The street was full of soldiers, and the coachman said to my mother, "I cannot go down." A soldier addressed my mother: "No one, ma'am, can go down this street:" to whom my mother replied, "I live here, and am going to my own home." An officer then gave permission for us, and the coachman with our box, to proceed, and we were soon at our own door. The coachman, ignorant of the passport which the handkerchief and ribbon had proved, said, on setting the box down, "You see, ma'am, we got on without my taking off my hat: for who would take off his hat to such a set of fellows? I would rather have sat there all the day long."

The assembling of the military in this street was to defend the dwellings of Mr. Kitchener and Mr. Heron, both these gentlemen being Roman Catholics. Mr. Kitchener (who was the father of Dr. Kitchener, the author of the *Cook's Oracle*) was an eminent coal merchant, whose wharf

was by the river-side southward, behind Beaufort Buildings, then called Worcester Grounds*, as the lane leading to it was called Worcester Lane: but Mr. Kitchener, or his successor Mr. Cox, endeavoured to change it by having "Beaufort Wharf" painted on their wagons. Thus the name "Worcester Grounds got lost; but the lane which bore the same name got no advantage by the change, for it received the appropriate title of "Dirty Lane," used only for carts and horses, foot passengers reaching the wharf by the steps at the bottom of Fountain Court and Beaufort Buildings.

But to return to my narrative. My parents soon removed us out of this scene of public confusion, to the house of a relative residing at St. Pancras; and well do I remember the painful interest with which, as soon as it got dark, the whole family of my uncle used to go on the roof of the house and count the number of fires, guessing the place of each. The alarm was so great, though at a distance, that it was always late before the family retired to rest. I remained at St. Pancras until the riots had been subdued and peace restored; and now, though very many matters crowd my mind, as report after report then reached us, I will leave them to record only what I personally saw and heard.

Before the vacation was ended, the trials of the prisoners had proceeded, and I went to a friend's house to see some condemned ones pass to execution. The house from which I had this painful view has been removed: the site is now the road to Waterloo Bridge. I believe it was because a lad was to be executed that I was allowed to go. The mournful procession passed up St. Catherine's Street, and from the distance I was, I could only see that the lad in height did not reach above the shoulders of the two men between whom he sat, who, with him, were to be executed

* Mr. Cunningham, vol. i. p. 69., gives an interesting quotation from Strype respecting Worcester House, which gave the name of "Worcester Grounds" to Mr. Kitchener's property.

in Russell Street. Universal and deep was the sympathy expressed towards the youth from the throng of people, which was considerable. As it was long before the street was sufficiently cleared to allow us to return home, the report came that the execution was over, and that the boy was so light that the executioner jumped on him to break his neck: and such was the effect of previous sympathy, that a feeling of horror was excited at the brutality (as they called it) of the action; but, viewing it calmly, it was wise, and intended kindly to shorten the time of suffering. While thus waiting, I heard an account of this boy's trial. A censure was expressed on the government for hanging one so young, when it was stated that this boy was the only one executed, though so many were guilty, as an example, as the proof of his guilt was unquestionable. A witness against him on the trial said, "I will swear that I have seen that boy actively engaged at several conflagrations." He was rebuked for thus positively speaking by the opposite counsel, when he said, "I am quite sure it is the active boy I have seen so often; for I was so impressed with his flagrant conduct that I cut a piece out of his clothes:" and putting his hand into his pocket, he pulled out the piece which he had cut off, which exactly fitted to the boy's jacket. This decided his execution: yet justice was not vindictive, for very few persons were executed.

I will trespass yet further on your pages to recite one other incident of the riots that occurred in connexion with the attack on the King's Bench prison, and the death of Allen, which made a great stir at the time. The incident I refer to happened thus:—At the gate of the prison two sentinels were placed. One of these was a fine-built young man, full six feet high: he had been servant to my father. On the day Allen was shot, or a day or two after, he came to my father for protection: my father having a high opinion of his veracity and moral goodness, took him in, and sheltered him until quiet was restored. His name was M'Phin, or some such name; but as he was always called "Mac" by us, I do not remember his name perfectly. He

stated that he and his fellow-soldier, while standing as sentries at the prison, were attacked by an uproarious mob, and were assailed with stones and brickbats;—that his companion called loudly to the mob, and said, "I will not fire until I see and mark a man that throws at us, and then he shall die. I don't want to kill the innocent, or any one; but he that flings at us shall surely die." Young Allen threw a brick-bat, and ran off; but Mac said, his fellow-soldier had seen it, and marked him. The crowd gave way; off went Allen and the soldier after him. Young Allen ran on, the soldier pursuing him, till he entered his father's premises, who was a cow-keeper, and *there* the soldier shot him. Popular fury turned upon poor Mac; and so completely was he thought to be the "murderer" of young Allen that 500*l.* was offered by the mob for his discovery. But my good father was faithful to honest Mac, and he lay secure in one of our upper rooms until the excitement was over.

Allen's funeral was attended by myriads, and a monument was erected to his memory (which yet remains, I believe) in Newington churchyard, speaking lies in the face of the sun. If it were important enough, it deserves erasure as much as the false inscription on London's monument.

As soon as the public blood was cool, "Mac" surrendered himself, was tried at the Old Bailey, and acquitted.

Should it be in the power of any of the readers of your interesting miscellany, by reference to the Session Papers, to give me the actual name of poor "Mac," I shall feel obliged.—Vol. ii. p. 273. SENEX.

The reminiscences of your correspondent SENEX concerning the riots of London in the last century form an interesting addition to the records of those troubled times; but in all these matters correctness as to dates and facts are of immense importance. The omission of a date, or the narration of events out of their proper sequence, will sometimes create vast and most mischievous confusion in the mind of the reader. Thus, from the order in which SENEX has stated his reminiscences, a reader unacquainted with

the events of the time will be likely to assume that the "attack on the King's Bench prison" and "the death of Allen" arose out of, and formed part and parcel of, the Gordon riots of 1780, instead of one of the Wilkes tumults of 1768. By the way, if SENEX was "personally either an actor or spectator" in *this* outbreak, he fully establishes his claim to the signature he adopts. I quite agree with him that monumental inscriptions are not always remarkable for their truth, and that the one in this case may possibly be somewhat tinged with popular prejudice or strong parental feeling; but, at all events, there can be but little doubt that poor Allen, whether guilty or innocent, was shot by a soldier of the Scotch regiment, be his name what it may; and further, the deed was not the effect of a random shot fired upon the mob,—for the young man was chased into a cow-house, and shot by his pursuer, away from the scene of conflict.

Noorthouck, who published his *History of London*, 1773, thus speaks of the affair:—

"The next day, May 10. (1768), produced a more fatal instance of rash violence against the people on account of their attachment to the popular prisoner (Wilkes) in the King's Bench. The parliament being to meet on that day to open the session, great numbers of the populace thronged about the prison from an expectation that Mr. W. would on that occasion recover his liberty; with an intention to conduct him to the House of Commons. On being disappointed they grew tumultuous, and an additional party of the third regiment of Guards were sent for. Some foolish paper had been stuck up against the prison wall, which a justice of the peace, then present, was not very wise in taking notice of, for when he took it down the mob insisted on having it from him, which he not regarding, the riot grew louder, the drums beat to arms, the proclamation was read, and while it was reading some stones and bricks were thrown. William Allen, a young man, son of Mr. Allen, keeper of the Horse Shoe Inn in Blackman Street, and who, *as appeared afterwards, was merely a quiet spectator*, being pursued along with others, was unfortunately singled out and followed by three soldiers into a cow-house, and shot dead! A number of horse-grenadiers arrived, and these hostile measures having no tendency to disperse the crowd, which rather increased, the people were fired upon, five or six were killed, and about fifteen

wounded; among which were two women, one of whom afterwards died in the hospital.

The author adds,—

"The soldiers were next day publicly thanked by a letter from the Secretary-at-War in his master's name. M'Laughlin, who actually killed the inoffensive Allen, was withdrawn from justice and could never be found, so that though his two associates Donald Maclaine and Donald Maclaury, with their commanding officer Alexander Murray, were proceeded against for the murder, the prosecution came to nothing and only contributed to heighten the general discontent."

With respect to the monument in St. Mary's, Newington, I extract the following from the *Oxford Magazine* for 1769, p. 39.:—

"Tuesday, July 25. A fine large marble tombstone, elegantly finished, was erected over the grave of Mr. Allen, junr., in the church-yard of St. Mary, Newington, Surry. It had been placed twice before, but taken away on some disputed points. On the sides are the following inscriptions:—

North Side.

Sacred to the Memory of
William Allen,
An Englishman of unspotted life and amiable disposition, [who was inhumanely murdered near St. George's Fields, the 10th day of May 1768, by the Scottish detachment from the army.] *

"His disconsolate parents, *inhabitants of this parish*, caused this tomb to be erected to an only son, lost to them and the world, in his twentieth year, as a monument of his virtues and their affections."

* * * * *

At page 53. of the same volume is a copperplate representing the tomb. On one side appears a soldier leaning on his musket. On his cap is inscribed "3rd Regt.;" his right hand points to the tomb; and a label proceeding from his mouth represents him saying, "I have obtained a pension of a shilling a day only for putting an end to thy days." At the foot of the tomb is represented a large thistle, from

* A foot-note informs us that "a white-wash is put over these lines between the crotchets."

the centre of which proceeds the words, "Murder screened and rewarded."

Accompanying this print are, among other remarks, the following:—

"It was generally believed that he was m———d by one Maclane, a Scottish soldier of the 3d Regt. The father prosecuted, Ad———n undertook the defence of the soldier. The solicitor of the Treasury, Mr. Nuthall, the deputy-solicitor, Mr. Francis, and Mr. Barlow of the Crown Office, attended the trial, and it is said, paid the whole expence for the prisoner out of the Treasury, to the amount of a very considerable sum. The defence set up was, that young Allen was not killed by Maclane, but by another Scottish soldier of the same regiment, one M'Laughlin, who confessed it at the time to the justice, as the justice says, though he owns he took no one step against a person who declared himself a murderer in the most express terms. . . . . The perfect innocence of the young man as to the charge of being concerned in any riot or tumult, is universally acknowledged, and a more general good character is nowhere to be found. This M'Laughlin soon made his escape, therefore was a deserter as well as a murtherer, yet he has had a discharge sent him with an allowance of a shilling a day."

Maclane was most probably the "Mac" alluded to by Senex; but his account differs in so many respects from contemporaneous records that I have ventured to trespass somewhat largely upon your space. I may add, that I by no means agree in the propriety of erasing a monumental inscription of more than eighty years' existence without some much stronger proof of its falsehood; for I quite coincide with the remarks of Rev. D. Lysons, in his allusion to this monument (*Surrey*, p. 393.), that

"Allen was illegally killed, whether he was concerned in the riots or not, *as he was shot apart from the mob at a time when he might, if necessary, have been apprehended and brought to justice.*"

Vol. ii. p. 332. E. B. Price.

The Rev. Dr. John Free* preached a sermon on the above occasion (which was printed) from the 24th chapter

* Dr. Free was of Christchurch, Oxford, and perhaps some of your readers may know where his biography is.

of Leviticus, 21st and 22nd verses, "He that killeth a man," &c.; and he boldly and fearlessly denominates the act as a murder, and severely reprehends those in authority who screened and protected the murderer. The sermon is of sixteen pages, and there is an appendix of twenty-six pages, in which are detailed various depositions, and all the circumstances connected with the catastrophe. — (Vol. ii. p. 333.) § N.

Your correspondent SENEX will find in Malcolm's *Anecdotes of London* (vol. ii. p. 74.), "A summary of the trial of Donald Maclane, on Tuesday last, at *Guildford Assizes*, for the murder of William Allen, Jun., on the 10th of May last, in St. George's Fields."—(Vol. ii. p. 334.)

R. BARKER, JUN.

Will you do me the favour to insert the following attempt to set right and disentangle the thread of my narrative respecting the death of young Allen? Certain it is that I was not an actor nor spectator in the riots of 1768, for they occurred some little time before I was born! It is equally certain that a man well remembered by me as our servant, whose name was "Mac," was a soldier concerned in the affair of Allen's death. As all the three soldiers had the prefix of "Mac," to their names, I cannot tell which of them it was, but it was *not* the man who really shot Allen, and *was never again heard of;* for "Mac," whom I so well remember, must have lived with my father *after* the affair of 1768, or *I* could not have known him. In my youthful remembrance, I have blended the story about him with the riots which I had witnessed in 1780: this is the best and only explanation I can give. Sure I am, that all my father related to me of that man was true. I presume the "Mac" I knew must have been Maclane, as your correspondent E. B. PRICE thinks probable, because of his trial and acquittal, which agrees with my father's statement; and especially as he was singled out and erroneously accused of the crime—as the quotation above referred to states. All I can say is, I can relate no more; I have told the story *as I remember it*, and for myself can only apolo-

gise that (though not so old as to witness the riots of 1768) I am old enough to experience that Time has laid his hand not only on my head to whiten my locks, but in this instance compels me to acknowledge that even the memories of my early days are, like the present, imperfect. The failure is with me, not with my father.

This vindication of my honoured parent's undoubted veracity reminds me of a circumstance that I have read or heard in a trial with regard to a right of way across an enclosure. Several aged men had given their evidence, when one said, "I remember that a public footpath for more than 100 years." "How old are you?" said the counsel. "Somewhere about eighty," was the reply. "How then do you remember the path for 100 years?" "I remember (said the old man firmly), when a boy, sitting on my father's knee, and he told me of a robbery that took place on that footpath; and so I know it existed *then*, for *my father never told a lie*." The point was carried, and the footpath remains open to this day, to tell to all generations *the beauty of truth*.—(Vol. ii. p. 446.) SENEX.

In Malcolm's *Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London during the eighteenth Century*, 4to. 1808, there is a

"Summary of the Trial of Donald Maclane, on Tuesday last, at Guildford Assizes, for the murder of William Allen, Jun., on the 10th of May last in St. George's Fields."

Upon the trial mention was made of the paper stuck up against the walls of the King's Bench Prison, from which it appears that it contained the following: —

> "Let * * * Judges, Ministers combine,
> And here great Wilkes and Liberty confine;
> Yet in each English heart secure their fame is,
> In spite of crowded levies at St. J———'s.
> Then while in prison Envy dooms their stay,
> Here grateful Britons daily homage pay."

The inscription upon the tomb of William Allen was visible in 1817, and in addition to the inscription on the north side, which was printed in "NOTES AND QUERIES" (Vol. ii. p. 333.), was as follows: —

South Side.

O disembody'd soul! most rudely driven
From this low orb (our sinful seat) to Heaven,
While filial piety can please the ear,
Thy name will still occur for ever dear:
This very spot now humaniz'd shall crave
From all a tear of pity on thy grave.
O flow'r of flow'rs! which we shall see no more,
No kind returning Spring can thee restore,
Thy loss thy hapless countrymen deplore.

East Side.

"O earth! cover not thou my blood."—*Job*, xvi. 18.

West Side.

"Take away the wicked from before the King, and His throne shall be established in righteousness."—*Prov.* xxiii. 5.

Fifteen months afterwards the father of William Allen presented a petition to his Majesty for vengeance on the murderers of his son.—(Vol. ii. p. 446.) O. SMITH.

LAMBERT, THE "ARCH-REBELL."

Mr. Hallam (*Const. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 26. ed. 1850), after some remarks on the execution of Vane, who was brought to trial together with Lambert in 1661, asserts that the latter, "whose submissive behaviour had furnished a contrast with that of Vane, was sent to Guernsey, and remained a prisoner for thirty years." Mr. Hallam does not quote his authority for this statement, which I also find in the older biographical dictionaries. There exists, however, in the library of the Plymouth Athenæum, a MS. record which apparently contradicts it. This is a volume called *Plimmouth Memoirs, collected by James Yonge*, 1684. It contains "a catalogue of all the Mayors, together with the memorable occurrences in their respective years," beginning in 1440. Yonge himself lived in Plymouth, and the later entries are therefore made from his own knowledge. There are two concerning Lambert:—

"1667. *Lambert, the arch-rebell, brought prisoner to this Iland.*"

[The Island of St. Nicholas at the entrance of the harbour, fortified from a very early period.]

"1683, Easter day. My Lord Dartmouth arrived in Plimm°. from Tangier. In March, Sir G. Jeffry, the famously [Query, *infamously*] loyal Lord Chief Justice, came hither from Launceston assize: lay at the Mayor's: viewed y^e^ citadells, M^t^ Edgecumbe, &c.

"The winter of this yeare proved very seveare. East wind, frost, and snow, continued three moneths: so that ships were starved in the mouth of the channell, and almost all the cattel famisht. Y^e^ fish left y^e^ coast almost 5 moneths. All provisions excessive deare; and had we not had a frequent supply from y^e^ East, corne would have been at 30^s^. per bushell,—above 130,000 bushells being imported hither, besides what went to Dartm°., Fowy, &c.

"The Thames was frozen up some moneths, so that it became a small citty, with boothes, coffee houses, taverns, glasse houses, printing, bull-baiting, shops of all sorts, and whole streetes made on it. The birdes of the aire died numerously. *Lambert, that olde rebell, dyed this winter on Plimm°. Island, where he had been prisoner* 15 *years and mo.*"

The trial of Lambert took place in 1661. He may have been sent at first to Guernsey, but could only have remained there until removed in 1667 to Plymouth. His imprisonment altogether lasted twenty-one years.

Lambert's removal to Plymouth has, I believe, been hitherto unnoticed. Probably it was thought a safer (and certainly, if he were confined in the little island of St. Nicholas, it was a severer) prison than Guernsey.—(Vol. iv. p. 339.) RICHARD JOHN KING.

Myles Halhead, as member of the Society of Friends, being at Plymouth in the year 1673, conceived that it was his duty to pay a visit to Lambert, who was then a prisoner on the island of St. Nicholas in Plymouth Sound. Myles' own account of this visit and of his conversation with Lambert may interest the readers of "NOTES AND QUERIES," not only inasmuch as it illustrates the valuable Note made by MR. RICHARD JOHN KING, but also because it places the character of the unfortunate old general in a favourable light. The account runs thus :—

"So I went to a Friend to desire him to procure a vessel that I might pass over to a little island near the King's great fort in Plymouth, that I might speak to John Lambert, who was a prisoner in that island, and a vessel we procured and passed to the island the same day, and there we found a strong guard of soldiers. A lieutenant asked me, What was my business to the island? I said I desire to speak to John Lambert: and then he asked me, If I was ever a captain under his command? And I said, No. The soldiers were very quiet and moderate: I desired the lieutenant to bring me to John Lambert; and so he did; and when I came before him I said, Friend, is thy name John Lambert? And he said, Yea: then said I unto him, Friend, I pray thee hear what the servant of the Lord hath to say to thee.

"Friend, the Lord God made use of thee and others for the deliverance of His people: and when you cryed to Him He delivered you in your distresses, as at Dunbar and other places, and gave you an opportunity into your hands to do good, and you promised what great things you would do for the Lord's people; but truly John Lambert you soon forgot your promises you made to the Lord in that day and time of your great distress, and turned the edge of your sword against the Lord's servants and hand-maids whom He sent forth to declare His eternal truth; and made laws, and consented to laws, and suffered and permitted laws to be made against the Lord's people.

"Then John Lambert answered and said, Friend, I would have you to know, that *some of us never made nor consented to laws to persecute you nor none of your friends, for persecution we ever were against.*

"I answered and said. John Lambert, it may be so; but the Scripture of truth is fulfilled by the best of you: for although that thee and some others have not given your consent to make laws against the Lord's people, yet ye suffered and permitted it to be made and done by others; and when power and authority was in your hands, you might but have spoken the word and the servants and hand-maids of the Lord might have been delivered out of the devourer's hands; but *none was found amongst you that would be seen to plead the cause of the innocent;* so the Lord God of life was grieved with you, because you sleighted the Lord and His servants, and began to set up your self-interest, and lay field to field, and house to house, and make your names great in the earth; then the Lord took away your power and authority, your manhood and your boldness, and caused you to flee before your enemies, and your hearts fainted for fear, and some ended their days in grief and sorrow, and some lie in holes and caves to this day; so the Lord God of Heaven and Earth will give a just

reward to every one according to his works: so my dear Friend, prize the great love of God to thee, who hath not given thy life into the hands of the devourers, but hath given thee thy life for a prey, and time to prepare thyself, that thou mayst end thy days in peace .

. . . . . .

Glory and honour, and living eternal praises to be given and returned to the Lord God and the Lamb for ever.

"So when I had cleared myself, he desired me to sit down, and so I did; and he called for beer, and gave me to drink; and when he had done, he said to me, Friend, I do believe thou speakest to me in love, and so I take it. Then he asked me, If I was at Dunbar fight? I answered, No. Then he said to me, How do you know what great danger we were in at that time? I answered, A little time after the fight I came that way and laid me down on the side of the mountain for the space of two hours, and viewed the town of Dunbar and the ground about it, where the English army lay; how the great ocean sea was on the one hand of them, and the hills and mountains on the other hand, and the great Scotch army before and behind them: then I took it into a serious consideration the great danger the English were in, and thought within myself, how greatly Englishmen were engaged to the great Lord of life for their deliverance, to serve Him in truth and uprightness of heart all the days of their appointed time. Truly, John, I never saw thy face before that I knew thee, although I have been brought before many of our English commanders in the time of Oliver Cromwell.

"Then John said, I pray you what commanders did you know? I knew Fleetwood, and have been before him when he was deputy in Ireland, and I knew General Disborrow, and have often been before him; and I knew Collonel Phenick, and hath been before him when he was gouernour of Edenbrough and the town of Leeth, in Scotland, and many more.

"John Lambert said, I knew the most of these men to be very moderate, and ever were against persecution.

"And I said, Indeed they were very moderate, and would not be much seen to persecute or be severe with the Lord's people; but truly John, they could suffer and permit others to do it, and took little notice of the suffering of the people of God; so *none were found to plead our cause*, but the Lord God of life and love. Glory be given and returned to His name for evermore.

"Then Lambert answered and said, Altho' you and your friends suffered persecution, and some hardship in that time, your cause therein is never the worse for that. I answered and said, That was very true, but let me tell thee John, in the plainness of my heart, that 's no thank to you, but glory to the Lord for ever.

"So he, and his wife, and two of his daughters, and myself, and a Friend of Plimouth, discoursed two hours or more in love and plainness of heart; for my heart was full of love to him, his wife, and children; and when I was free, I took my leave of them, and parted with them in love."—*Sufferings and Passages of Myles Halhead*, 1690.

It is not easy to understand Myles' assertion that "none was found amongst you that would be seen to plead the cause of the innocent:" for it must be acknowledged, to the credit of the parliamentarians, that several of their leading men did sometimes interfere openly and successfully to restrain the persecution which the early "Friends" continually drew upon themselves by their bold and frequent denunciations of a hireling clergy, sometimes uttered in the market-place, sometimes in the very parish church.

William Penn gratefully records —

"the tender and singular indulgence of Judge Bradshaw and Judge Fell . . . . . especially Judge Fell, who was not only a check to their the [clergy's] rage in the course of legal proceedings, but otherwise upon occasion, and finally countenanced this people; for his wife receiving the truth with the first, it had that influence upon his spirit, *being a just and wise man*, and seeing in his own wife and family a full confutation to all the popular clamours against the way of truth, that he covered them what he could, and freely opened his doors and gave up his house to his wife and her Friends."

George Fox also mentions that —

"the said Judge Fell was very serviceable in his day and time, to stop the rage of the priests, justices, and rude multitude."

And he relates further that, upon one occasion, in the year 1652, when —

"Many priests appeared against me and Friends; Judge Fell, and Justice West, stood up nobly for us and the truth; and our adversaries were confounded; so that he was as a wall for God's people against them. And afterwards he came to see beyond the priests, and at his latter end seldom went to hear them in that [Ulverston] parish.

Moreover the Protector himself, on being informed in

the year 1656 that George Fox, and others, were ill-used in Cornwall, sent down an order to the governour of Pendennis Castle to examine the matter; and Fox says:—

"This was of great service in the country: for afterwards Friends might have spoken in any market-place or steeple-house thereabouts, and none would meddle with them."

To this may be added, that after the deaths of the lord president Bradshaw, Judge Fell, and Oliver Cromwell, the soldiers being rude and troublesome at Friends' meetings, General Monk gave forth an order, dated 9th March, 1659, requiring

"All officers and soldiers to forbear to disturb the peaceable meetings of the Quakers, they doing nothing prejudicial to the parliament or commonwealth."—(Vol. vi. p. 103.)

J. Lewelyn Curtis.

In the *Macclesfield Correspondence* (vol. ii. p. 31.) is a letter from the Rev. Thomas Baker to Collins, as is supposed, dated Sept. 4, '78, which ends thus:—

"Major-General Lambert, prisoner at Plymouth, hath sent me these problems to be solved. I desire the solutions of them (having sent mine to him):

"Prob. 1. $a : b :: c : d$
$aa + bb + cc + dd = 250.$
$b + 5 = c.$
$a + 9 = d.$ Qu. a, b, c, d?

"Prob. 2. $aa + bb + cc + dd = 756.$
$b + 6 = c.$
$b - 9 = a.$ Qu. a, b, c, d?

(Vol. vi. p. 183.)—M.

Noble, in his *House of Cromwell*, vol. i. p. 369., says, Mrs. Lambert has been supposed to have been partial to the Protector; "that her name was *Fra*, an elegant and accomplished woman. She had a daughter, married to a Welsh judge, whom she survived, and died in January, 1736–7."—(Vol. vii. p. 237.) G.

Major-General Lambert appears, from a meagre memoir of him given in the *History of Malham in Yorkshire*, by

Thomas Hursley: 8vo. 1786, to have descended from a very ancient family in that county. According to the register of Kirkby Malhamdale, he was born at Calton Hall, in that parish, 7th of September, 1619, and lost his father at the age of thirteen. On the 10th of September, 1639, he married Frances, daughter of his neighbour Sir William Lister, of Thornton, in Craven, then in her seventeenth year, and said to have been a most elegant and accomplished lady. Nothing seems to be known as to the precise time or place of the death of Lambert or his wife, beyond the tradition of his having been imprisoned in Cornet Castle, in the island of Guernsey, after the Restoration, and that he remained in confinement thirty years. His marriage is confirmed in the account of Lord Ribblesdale's family in Collins' *Peerage*, vol. viii. edition Brydges. John Lambert, son and heir of the major-general, married Barbara, daughter of Thomas Lister, of Arnoldsbigging, and had by her three sons, who all died v. p., and one daughter, who was the wife of Sir John Middleton, of Belsay Castle, in Northumberland, and became the heir-general of her family. Pepys speaks of Lady Lambert in 1668. BRAYBROOKE.—(vii. p. 269.)

LORD BRAYBROOKE speaks of a *tradition* of Major-General Lambert's having been imprisoned in Cornet Castle, in the island of Guernsey, after the Restoration. The following documents, copies of which exist in Guernsey, will prove that he really was kept as a prisoner in that island:

CHARLES R.

Upon suite made unto us by Mrs. Lambert, for liberty for herself and children to goe to and remaine wth her husband Collonell Lambert yo^{r} prisoner, Wee, graciously inclyninge to gratifye her in that request, have thought fitt to signify our royall pleasure to you in that particular, willing and requiring you, upon sight hereof, to suffer the said Mrs. Lambert, her three children, and three maid-servants, to goe and remaine wth the said Mr. Lambert, under the same confinement he himself is, untill o^{r} further

pleasure be knowne. And for soe doinge this shalbe y^r^ warrant. Given at our Court at Whitehall, the 17^th^ day Febr., 166½. By his Ma^ts^ Comand,

EDW. NICHOLAS.

To our right trusty and wellbeloved Counsello^r^
S^r^ Hugh Pollard, K^nt^ and Bar^t^, Governo^r^ of our
Island of Guernsey and Castle there, or to
other our Governo^r^ for y^e^ tyme beinge, and in
his absence to his Deputy Governo^r^.
This is a true copie of his Ma^t's^ Warrant.

(Signed) HUGH POLLARDE.

[In dorso.]

The King's order for Lambert's children.

In 1662, Christopher Lord Hatton was appointed Governor of Guernsey, upon which the following warrant was issued:

CHARLES R.

Our will and pleasure is, That you take into your custody the person of John Lambert, commonly called Collonell Lambert, and keepe him close prisoner, as a condemned traytor, untill further order from us, for which this shall be your warrant. Given at our Court at Hampton Court, this 25^th^ day of July, 1662.

By his Ma^ty's^ Comand,

EDW. NICHOLAS.

To our trusty and welbeloved Councellor y^e^ Lord
Hatton, Governor of our Island of Guernsey,
and to the Lieutenant Governo^r^ thereof or his
Deputy.

Lambert to Guernsey.

Four months later the following order was issued:

CHARLES R.

Our will and pleasure is, That from sight hereof you give such liberty and indulgence to Collonell John Lambert your prisoner, within the precincts of that our island, as will consist with the security of his person, and as in

your discretion you shall think fitt; and that this favour be continued to him till you receive our order to the contrary, allwayes understood, that he the sayd Collonell Lambert show himself worthy thereof in his comportment, and entertaine noe correspondencyes to the prejudice of our service, for which this shall be your warrant. Given at our Court at Whitehall, November the eighteenth, one thousand six hundred sixty-two,

By his Ma^ts^ command,
HENRYE BENNET.

To our trusty and well-beloved Counsellor the Lord Hatton, our govern^r^ of our Island of Guernsey, to his Leiftenant Governour, or other officer commanding in chief there.

Liberty of the Island to Mr. Lambert.
[In dorso.]
The King's order for Mr. Lambert's liberty.

In Rees's *Cyclopædia*, art. AMARYLLIS, sect. 27., *A. Sarniensis*, Guernsey lily, I find the following statement: "It was cultivated at Wimbledon, in England, by General Lambert, in 1659." As Guernsey, during the civil wars, sided with the Parliament, it is probable that Lambert procured the roots from some friend in the island.

The exact date of his arrival as a prisoner in Guernsey is fixed by a sort of journal kept by Pierre Le Roy, schoolmaster and parish clerk of St. Martin de la Bellouse in that island, who says:

"Le 17^e^ de 9vembre. 1661, est arrivé au Château Cornet, Jean Lambert, général des rebelles sectères en Angleterre, ennemy du roy, et y est constitué prisonnier pour sa vie."

There is no tradition in the island of his having died there. I remember to have read, but cannot at present remember where, that he died a Roman Catholic.

EDGAR MACCULLOCH.—(vii. p. 459.)

CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS IN HENRY VIII.'S REIGN.

The Rev. Henry Walter writes as follows:—Reading Macaulay's *Critical Essays*, I perceive that in 1830, when reviewing Southey's *Colloquies on Society*, he has said:

"Let them add to all this the *fact*, that 72,000 persons suffered death by the hands of the executioner during the reign of Henry VIII., and judge between the nineteenth and the sixteenth century."

Whether Mr. Macaulay's subsequent more extensive historical researches would let him still call that a *fact*, I cannot presume to say. But it is notoriously referred to as a fact, by popular speakers or writers, from time to time; and your useful publication is favourable to having the question so ventilated, as either to put an end to the assumption of this imaginary proof of the ferocity of English tribunals temp. Henry VIII., or to elicit some trustworthy evidence of its being a fact.

To unreflecting readers of English history it may be enough that Hume has said at the close of his account of Henry VIII., ch. xxxiii.:—

"The prisoners in the kingdom for debts and crimes are asserted in an act of parliament to be 60,000 persons and above; which is scarcely credible. Harrison asserts that 72,000 criminals were executed during this reign for theft and robbery, which would amount nearly to 2,000 a year."

The credit due to such an assertion as the first, from its having been introduced into an act of parliament, can differ very little from the credit due to its independent probability. For so gross was the ignorance of national statistics prevalent in that age, that an observant and conscientious member of the inns of court, Mr. Simon Fish, could gravely tell the public, in his noted address to Henry VIII., styled *The Supplication of Beggars*, that there were 52,000 parish churches within the realms of England, and could found upon this statement a methodical calculation of considerable importance, whilst modern returns reduce the number of parishes below 11,000.

As to Harrison's assertion in the Historical Treatise appended to Holinshed's *Chronicles*, I have not seen it for some years, and have not access to it at present; but unless my memory deceives me, he made the assertion on no better authority than that of the Bishop of Tarbes, whom Francis I. sent to England; that prelate's dislike to Henry's proceedings, and to the anti-papal spirit of our nation, made him but too willing to believe any slander against either, whilst the tale suits Harrison's object, which was to set forth the advantages enjoyed by Elizabeth's subjects, the progress of wealth and civilisation, as compared with their state under her father's reign.

When we come to the earliest authority for any historical statement, it is always prudent to consider whether the author could have known what he states to be true. There is no probability that Henry's parliament had required such returns from all the gaols in the kingdom as would entitle its assertion respecting the number of prisoners to the weight belonging to any modern official document; neither is there any probability that a French bishop could have made any nearer approximation to the number of executions than a conjecture, even if he had desired to keep within the truth.

The estimate of the population of England at that date must also be acknowledged to rest upon grounds which are far from being indisputable. But it has been made without any motive for arriving at a false conclusion; and it justifies the belief that the population was rather under than above 3,000,000, and consequently the number of males not more than 1,500,000; who must be again reduced to about a half, or 750,000, to obtain the number of males between 21 years and 70. Imprisonment for debt is nearly limited to this portion of the people; and imprisonment for crimes fell almost as exclusively on the same, when the offences visited by the law were chiefly crimes of violence, or sheep and deer stealing: so that if 60,000 persons were in prison for debt and crimes, at least 55,000 of them would be adult males, that is, about one adult male out of every

fifteen; and if 2000 were executed yearly, when so many felonies were but punished with whipping, provided the felon could repeat his neck-verse, one out of 375 men must be believed to have fallen annually by the executioner's hands. Are we to believe this?

The letters from a justice of the peace to Lord Burleigh, given in the Appendix to vol. iv. of Strype's *Annals*, Nos. 212. and 213., contain some remarkable gaol statistics for the county of Somerset. According to him, forty persons were executed for offences in that county in 1596; and he complains grievously of the hardship inflicted on the county by its being obliged to expend 73*l.* on the relief of the prisoners, to whom they yet allowed but at the rate of 6*d.* a week. The imprisonments must have been therefore generally brief.—(xi. p. 21.) This produced the following:

I have no disposition to plead for the truth of the fact alleged by Hume and Macaulay, on the authority of Harrison, or to lessen the weight of Mr. Walter's arguments in support of his doubts; but as I have looked into Harrison, I may as well quote what he says on the subject, for the sake of rectifying two errors into which Mr. Walter has fallen:—1. That Harrison's authority was the Bishop of Tarbes; 2. That "his object was to set forth the advantages enjoyed by Elizabeth's subjects, as compared with their state under her father's reign." The following are his words:

"It appeareth by Cardane (who writeth it upon the report of the Bishop of Lexovia) in the geniture of King Edward the sixt, how Henrie the eight, executing his laws verie seuerelie against such idle persons, I meane great theeues, pettie theeues and roges, did hang up three score and twelve thousand of them in his time. He seemed for a while greatlie to have terrified the rest: but *since his death the number of them is so increased*, yea although we have had no warres, which are a great occasion of their breed . . . *that except some better order be taken, or the lawes alreadie made be better executed, such as dwell in vplandish townes and little villages shall liue but in small safetie and rest.*"—Harrison's *Description of England*, chap. ii.

I have verified the reference to Cardan, who, towards

the conclusion of his geniture of Edward VI., speaking of his father Henry VIII., says,—

"*Antistes Lexoviensis* mihi narrabat Besuntii, scilicet ut biennio antequam periret inventa sint LXXII millia hominum judicio et carnifice sub hoc rege periisse."

The "antistes Lexoviensis," or Bishop of Lisieux, spoken of, was probably Jacques d'Annebaut, who, according to the *Gallia Christiana*, occupied that see from 1545 to 1558. —(vol. xi. p. 134.) 'Αλιεύς.

QUEEN ELIZABETH AND SIR HENRY NEVILL.

Many years ago I copied the following note from a volume of Berkshire pedigrees in the British Museum, my reference to which is unluckily lost.

"Queen Elizabeth, in her first progress at Maidenhithe Bridge, being mett by all the Nobility, Kn^ts^, and Esquires of Berks, they kneeling on both sides of her way, shee alighted at the bridge foot, and walked on foote through the midst, and coming just agaynst Sir Henry Nevill of Billingbear, made a stay, and leyd her glove on his head, saying, 'I am glad to see thee *Brother Henry*.' Hee, not pleased with the expression, swore she would make the court believe hee was a bastard, at which shee laughed, and passed on."

The masquing scene in *Henry VIII.*, as described by Holinshed, perhaps furnishes a clue to the Queen's pleasantry, though Shakspeare has omitted the particular incident relating to Sir Henry Nevill. The old chronicler, after giving an account of Wolsey's banquet, and the entrance of a noble troop of strangers in masks, amongst whom he suspected that the king made one, proceeds as follows:—

"Then the Lord Chamberlain said to the Cardinal, Sir, they confesse that among them there is such a noble personage whom, if your Grace can appointe out 'from the rest, he is content to disclose himself and to accept your place.' Whereupon the Cardinal, taking good advisement among them, at the last quoth he, 'Me seemeth the gentleman in the black beard should be even he,' and with that he arose out of his chaire and offered the same to the gentleman in

the black beard, with his cap in his hand. The person to whom he offered the chaire was Sir Edward Nevill, a comelie knight, that much more resembled the king's person in that mask than anie other. The King perceiving the Cardinal so deceived, could not forbear laughing, and pulled down his visor and Maister Nevill's too."

Sir Edward Nevill of Aldington, in Kent, was the second surviving son of George Nevill, Lord Abergavenny, and the father of Sir Henry Nevill above mentioned, who laid the foundation-stone and built the body and one wing of Billingbear House, which still belongs to his descendant. Sir Edward Nevill was beheaded for high treason in 1538, his likeness to Henry VIII. not saving him from the fate which befell so many of that king's unhappy favourites.

BRAYBROOKE.—(ii. p. 307.)

CHARLES THE FIRST AND BARTOLOMEO DELLA NAVE'S COLLECTION OF PICTURES.

Among some miscellaneous papers in a volume of the Birch MSS. in the British Museum (Add. 4293. fol. 5.) is preserved a curious document illustrative of the love of Charles I. for the fine arts, and his anxiety to increase his collection of paintings, which, as it has escaped the notice of Walpole and his annotators, I transcribe below.

"CHARLES R.

"Whereas wee vnderstand that an excellent Collection of paintings are to be solde in Venice, whiche are knowen by the name of Bartolomeo della Nave his Collection, Wee are desirous that our beloved servant Mr. William Pettye, should goe thither to make the bargayne for them, Wee our selues beinge resolved to goe a fourthe share in the buyinge of them (soe it exceed not the sõme of Eight hundred powndes sterlinge), but that our Name be concealed in it. And if it shall please God that the same Collection be bought and come safelye hither, Then wee doe promise on the word of a Kinge, that they shall be divyded with all equallitye in this maner, vid^{t}. That, they shall be equallie divyded into fower partes by some men skillfull in paintinge, and then everie one interested in the shares, or some for them, shall throwe the Dice severallye, and whoesoever throwes moste, shall choose his share first, and soe in order everye one shall choose after first, as he castes most, and shall take their

shares freelye to their owne vses, as they shall fall vnto them. In wittnes whereof wee haue sett our hande, this Eight daye of July, in the Tenth year of our Reigne, 1634."

The individual employed by Charles in this negotiation is the same who collected antiquities in Greece for the Earl of Arundel. He was Vicar of Thorley, in the Isle of Wight, and is believed to have been the uncle of the celebrated Sir William Petty, ancestor of the Marquis of Lansdowne. It would be curious to learn the particulars of the "bargayne" made by him, and how the pictures were disposed of after their arrival in England. Were the Warrant and Privy Seal books of the period (still remaining among the Exchequer records) easily accessible, no doubt some information on these points might be gained. That this collection of Bartolomeo della Nave was a celebrated one, we have the testimony of Simon Vouet, in a letter to Ferrante Carlo, written from Venice, August 14, 1627, in which he speaks of it as a "studio di bellissime pitture" (Bottari, *Lettere Pittoriche*, vol. i. p. 335.: Milano, 1822): and that it came over to England, is asserted repeatedly by Ridolfi, in his *Vite degli illustri Pittori Veneti*, the first edition of which appeared at Venice in 1648. He mentions in this work several which were in Della Nave's collection, and which it may be interesting to refer to here, in case they are still to be traced in England. In vol. i. p. 107. (I quote the Padua edition of 1835), is noticed a painting by Vincenzio Catena, representing Judith carrying the head of Holofernes in one hand, and a sword in the other. In the same volume, p. 182., a portrait of Zattina by Palma il Vecchio, holding in her hand "una zampina dorata;" and at p. 263. several sacred subjects by Titian, among which is specified one, of the Virgin surrounded by Saints, and another, of the woman taken in adultery, with "molti ritratti" by the same. Again, at p. 288., a head of a lady, supposed to be the mother of the artist Nadelino da Murano, one of the most talented pupils of Titian; and at p. 328. a painting by Andrea Schiavone, and some designs of Parmigiano. In vol. ii. p. 123. are men-

tioned two paintings by Battista Zelotti from Ovid's Fables; and at p. 141. a picture of the Good Samaritan, by Japoco da Ponte of Bassano. For these references to Bottari and Ridolfi, I own myself indebted to Mr. William Carpenter, the keeper of the department of engravings in the British Museum. I do not find this purchase noticed in Vanderdort's list of Charles's pictures, published by Walpole in 1757. F. MADDEN.—(iii. p. 236.)

THE LAST SURVIVORS OF ENGLAND'S GREAT BATTLES.

It has been often observed, that some of the most signal instances of longevity are to be found amongst those who have passed their early years in the fatigues and privations of active military life. Judging by cases already before our eyes, it is not unlikely that many a youth will be able to talk of the dangers he has confronted at Inkerman and Balaklava in the middle of the twentieth century. Let the following list show how well-founded is such a supposition:—

Edgehill, 1642.—William Hazeland, a native of Wiltshire, who died in 1732, aged one hundred and twelve (on his tomb at Chelsea, the name is spelt Hiseland). He was twenty-two when he fought for the Parliament at Edgehill; after which he bore his part all through the civil war, was in William of Orange's army in Ireland, and closed his services under the renowned Duke of Marlborough; having borne arms eighty years. The Duke of Richmond and Sir Robert Walpole, in consideration of his long services, each allowed him a crown a week sometime before his death. The old man helped himself another way; being recorded in Faulkner's account of Chelsea as having married three times after attaining the age of one hundred, though his epitaph, to be given presently, would certainly lead us to infer that such an event took place only once after that advanced period. His last marriage was contracted the year before his death, viz. Aug. 9, 1731. A picture of him

taken at the age of one hundred and ten is still extant. Now for his epitaph.

"Here rests WILLIAM HISELAND,
A veteran if ever soldier was.
Who merited well a pension,
If long service be a merit:
Having served upwards of the days of man;
Ancient, but not superannuated.
Engaged in a series of wars,
Civil as well as foreign;
Yet not maimed or worn out by either.
His complexion was florid and fresh,
His health hale and hearty,
His memory exact and ready.
In stature he excelled the military size:
In strength surpassed the prime of youth:
And what made his age still more patriarchal,
When above one hundred years old,
He took unto him a wife.
Read, fellow-soldiers, and reflect
That there is a spiritual warfare,
As well as a warfare temporal.
Born 6 August, 1620
Died 7 February, 1732 } Aged 112."

Oliver Cromwell's Veterans.—The last two of the "Ironsides" appear to have been Alexander McCullock, residing near Aberdeen at the time of his death in 1757, aged one hundred and thirty-two; and Colonel Thomas Winslow of Tipperary, in Ireland, who died in 1766, at the extraordinary age of one hundred and forty-six. He held the rank of captain when accompanying Oliver on the famous expedition to Ireland in 1649. But perhaps the most remarkable relic of that period, transmitted to our own times, was the son of one of Oliver's drummers; which son was living near Manchester, so recently as 1843, at the age of one hundred and twenty. This was James Horrocks, whose father, supposing him to have been a drummer boy of the age of ten at the Protector's death in 1658, need not have been more than seventy-five at the birth of the son; so that the case is quite credible. (*Manchester Guardian.*)

Siege of Namur, 1695 (where William of Orange personally commanded).—Mr. Fraser, of the Royal Hospital at Kilmainham, near Dublin, who lost his arm in the trenches by a cannon-shot at Namur, attained the age of one hundred and eighteen, and died in 1768. But much more recent were the deaths of the two following individuals belonging to William's army.

Matthew Champion of Great Yarmouth, who came over with the prince in 1688 (his father being a farrier in that army), and who lived till 1793, being then one hundred and eleven years of age; and,

David Caldwell of Bridgnorth, born the year after William's arrival, who commenced his career as a drummer, and ended a soldier's life in 1796, at the age of one hundred and seven. He may be said to have been a soldier *ab ovo*, born in the army in the town of Ayr.

Capture of Gibraltar by Admiral Sir George Rooke, in 1704.—John Campbell, died 1791, aged one hundred and twenty, at Dungannon in Ireland, though a native of Scotland. He served as a marine.

Matthew Tait of Auchinleck, in Ayrshire, died 1792, aged one hundred and twenty-three; a soldier.

John Ramsay of Collercotes, near North Shields, died so recently as 1807, aged one hundred and fifteen. He was of a remarkably cheerful disposition, and often amused himself and his friends with an old song. He was a seaman.

Soldiers serving under the Duke of Marlborough during the Reign of Queen Anne.—Of these, a very considerable list might be given of individuals surpassing the age of one hundred. The more recently deceased are the following:

Alexander Kilpatrick, Esq., Colonel of an Irish regiment of foot, died at Longford, in Ireland, in 1783, aged one hundred and sixteen.

McLeod of Inverness, died 1790, aged one hundred and two. Two years before his death, having married a second wife, he walked to London in nineteen days to solicit an increase of his pension.

William Billings of Fairfield Head, near Longnor, in Staffordshire, died 1791, aged one hundred and fourteen: long supposed to be the only survivor of the great duke's army; died in a cottage not a hundred yards from the place of his nativity.

John Jackson, of Burnew Castle, gunner; served in nineteen actions; died 1799, aged one hundred and seventeen.

Ambrose Bennett, of Tetbury, in Gloucestershire; sixty years a private soldier; died 1800, aged one hundred and six.

Henry Francesco, of White Hall, near New York, died 1820, aged one hundred and thirty-four. This remarkable case is mentioned in Silliman's *Tour between Hartford and Quebec*, in 1819, where he is described as a Frenchman; but he may with fairness be claimed as the last relic of the army of Marlborough, for he was not only a native of England, but practised as a drummer at the coronation of Queen Anne.

The last surviving seaman who served in Anne's reign, was J. Jennings, of Gosport, who died 1814, at the age of one hundred and nine.

Sheriffmuir, 1715, *or the Rebellion of the elder Pretender.* —Alexander Campbell, of Kincardine; who, at the age of sixteen, fought under Lord Ross; lived till 1816, at which time he was one hundred and seventeen years old. A year before his death, he put himself to school to the Gaelic Society, and learned to spell and lost his sight together. One of his latest acts was to walk to the residence of Lord Ashburton, who presented him with as many shillings as he had lived years. In his dress, he steadily adhered to the kilt, and always walked very erect, with his neck and breast bare.

Dettingen, 1743.—Lieut.-Colonel Sir William Innes, of Balvenie, Ipswich, baronet. On that occasion he fought as a volunteer in the lifeguards. His death occurred in 1817, at the age of one hundred.

In the following year died another veteran, who survived

the same fight seventy-five years. This was John Reid, of Delnies, near Nairn, of the second battalion of Royal Scots, aged one hundred and four years. He also served at Fontenoy, Culloden, and Quebec. He never required glasses to assist his sight, though he spent much of his later years in reading, principally the Bible.

Fontenoy, 1745.—Edmund Barry, of Watergrass Hill, in Ireland, died 1822, aged one hundred and thirteen. He was six feet two in height, and walked well to the last.

Coupled with his name, is that of the Amazon Phœbe Hessel, who merits a more lengthened notice. Living at Brighton, her case became known to George IV., then Prince Regent, who thereupon sent to ask her what sum of money would render her comfortable? "Half-a-guinea a week," replied old Phœbe, "will make me as happy as a princess." This, therefore, by his majesty's command, was regularly paid her till the day of her death; which took place at Brighton, December 12, 1821, when she had attained the age of one hundred and eight years. Her monument in the churchyard states that she was born at Chelsea in 1713; that she served for many years as a private soldier in the fifth regiment of foot in different parts of Europe, and received a bayonet wound in the arm at Fontenoy.

Culloden, 1746, *and the Rebellion of the younger Pretender.*—Here we must distinguish between the contending parties; and first, for the king's soldiers:—

William Broughton, of Neston, died in 1816, aged one hundred and six. He remained a healthy and industrious labourer till his end. He used to call himself "one of King George's hard bargains," having drawn his pension more than sixty years.

The three following were adherents of Charles Edward:—

Gillies McKechnie, of Gourock, who died in 1814, aged one hundred and four, having but a short time previously declared that he was still ready to shed his blood in the same cause.

John Fraser, a native of Strathspey, who died at Dundee in 1817, aged one hundred.

—— Grant, living on the estates of the Hon. W. Maule, near Montrose, presented a memorial to the king through Sir B. Bloomfield, soliciting a pension; and stating, among other arguments, that if not the oldest of his majesty's loyal subjects, he was at all events the oldest of his majesty's enemies; having fought at Culloden Muir in the behalf of Charles Stuart, and being now [1835?] one hundred and eight years of age. King William immediately ordered him 1*l.* a week; and the same to be continued to his daughter who attended him (herself being seventy), should she survive.

Taking of Quebec, 1759, *by Wolfe.*— James Stuart, of Tweedmouth, commonly called "the last of the Stuarts," recently living, at the age of one hundred and fifteen. For sixty years, and more, he frequented the "Borders" as a wandering minstrel; and had many a tale to tell of the "Young Chevalier," with whom he had drunk wine, and to whom it is supposed he was distantly related. He appears to have served both on land and sea. His strength was prodigious.

Abraham Miller, living so recently as 1852 among the Indians in Grey-township, Simcoe county, Canada, at the age of one hundred and fifteen years.

J. Waylen.—(xi. p. 319.)

In the second part of *Annals of Health*, by Joseph Taylor (published by Effingham Wilson in 1818), under the head of "Records of Longevity," is a long list of persons who have lived to extreme old age. I do not know who were Mr. Taylor's authorities for the cases he enumerates, but among them I find the following veterans of the army:

Battle of Londonderry.— "Thomas Wimms died in 1791, near Tuam in Ireland, aged 117. He had been formerly a soldier, and fought in the battle of Londonderry in 1701."

Battle of Edgehill.— "Of William Walker there is an excellent mezzotinto likeness, bearing the following inscription:

'William Walker,
Born near Ribchester in Lancashire, anno 1613,
Died anno 1736.
At the battle of Edgehill he was in the Royal Service,
Wounded in the arm, and had two horses
Shot under him.'"

Capture of Gibraltar. — "John Ramsay, a mariner, died at Collercoats, near North Shields, in January, 1808, at the age of 115 years. He served in the capacity of cabin boy on one of the ships in Sir George Rooke's squadron, at the taking of Gibraltar in 1704."

Battle of Preston Pans. — "William Gillespie, an old Chelsea pensioner, died at Ruthwell, in the county of Dumfries, Scotland, June 15, 1818. He was 102 years old. He enlisted, when young, in the Inniskillen Dragoons, and served in the German wars under Lord Stair, in 1743-4." He subsequently saved a stand of colours at Preston Pans, which he took to Colonel Gardner.

Capture of Quebec. — "Samuel Mogg died in the summer of 1812, at the age of 102. He served under General Wolfe at the taking of Quebec."

Spanish Armada. — "In Bunbury Church, Cheshire, is the monument of Sir George Beeston, who was an admiral in the British fleet when the Spanish Armada was destroyed in the year 1588. . . . Sir George died in 1601, at the advanced age of 102."

Soldiers of William III. and Queen Anne. — "William Marshall, of Kirkcudbright, tinker, a native of Kirkmichael, Ayrshire, died in 1792; was present at the siege of Derry, and afterwards entered the Dutch service. — William Billings died at Fairfield Head, near Longnor in Staffordshire, in the autumn of 1793, aged 114. He was the last survivor in England of the Duke of Marlborough's privates. — Paul Hausen, a native of Germany, died at Hedingham, Norfolk, in 1781, in the 108th year of his age. He had been a resident in seven kingdoms, and served under the Duke of Marlborough. — Sergeant Donald MacLeod, born in 1688, in the parish of Bracedill, in the Isle

of Skye, was alive in 1797. He served under the Duke of Marlborough, the Duke of Argyle in 1715, the Duke of Cumberland in Flanders, the Marquis of Granby in Germany, and Sir Henry Clinton in the American War, as well as in Ireland, and in the French war in America in 1757, and was present at the reduction of Louisbourg and Quebec.

Soldier of George I. and II. — "Joshua Crewman, a pensioner at Chelsea Hospital, died in 1794, at the age of 123."

Ramsay, Gillespie, Billings and MacLeod are mentioned by Mr. Waylen; but I have quoted Mr. Taylor's version, as it differs in some particulars, although how much credit is to be attached to it I know not.

ALEXANDER ANDREWS.—(xi. p. 418.)

MALTA THE BURIAL-PLACE OF HANNIBAL.

Malta affords a fine field for antiquarian research; and in no part more so than in the neighbourhood of Citta Vecchia, where for some distance the ground is dotted with tombs which have already been opened.

Here, in ancient times, was the site of a burial-place; but for what people, or at what age, is now unknown; and here it is that archæologists should commence their labours, that in the result they may not be disappointed. In some of the tombs which have been recently entered in this vicinity, fragments of linen cloth have been seen, in which bodies were enveloped at the time of their burial; in others glass, and earthen candlesticks, and jars, hollow throughout, and of a curious shape; while in a few were ear-rings and finger-rings made of the purest gold; but they are rarely found.

There cannot be a doubt that many valuable antiquities will yet be discovered; and, in support of this presumption, I would only refer to those now known to exist, the Giant's Tower at Gozo, the huge tombs in the Bengemma Hills, and those extensive and remarkable ruins at Krendi, which were excavated by order of the late Sir Henry Bouverie, and

remain as a lasting and honourable memento of his rule, being among the number.

An antiquary, being at Malta, cannot pass a portion of an idle day more agreeably than in visiting some singular sepulchral chambers not far from Notabile, which are built in a rocky eminence, and with entrances several feet from the ground. These are very possibly the tombs of the earliest Christians, who tried in their erection "to imitate that of our Saviour, by building them in the form of caves, and closing their portals with marble or stone." When looking at these tombs from a terrace near the Cathedral, we were strongly reminded of those which were seen by our lately deceased friend Mr. John L. Stephens, and so well described by him in his *Incidents of Travel* in eastern lands. Had we time or space, we should more particularly refer to several other interesting remains now scattered over the island, and, among them, to that curious sepulchre not a long time ago discovered in a garden at Rabato. We might write of the inscription on its walls, "In pace posita sunt," and of the figures of a dove and hare which were near it, to show that the ashes of those whom they buried there were left in peace. We might also make mention, more at length, of a tomb which was found at the point Beni Isa in 1761, having on its face a Phœnician inscription, which Sir William Drummond thus translates:

"The interior room of the tomb of Ænnibal, illustrious in the consummation of calamity. He was beloved. The people, when they are drawn up in order of battle, weep for Ænnibal the son of Bar Malek."

Sir Grenville Temple remarks that the great Carthaginian general is supposed, by the Maltese, to have been a native of their island, and one of the Barchina family, once known to have been established in Malta, while some writers have stated that his remains were brought from Bithynia to this island, to be placed in the tomb of his ancestors; and this supposition, from what we have read, may be easily credited.

ISABEL, QUEEN OF THE ISLE OF MAN.

The following communications appeared in reply to a query with reference to "Isabel, wife of Baron Fitz-warren, sometime Queen of the Isle of Man," mentioned in Charles Knight's *London* as having been buried in the church of the Grey Friars.

This lady was the wife of William Lord Fitz-Warine, who died in 35 Edward III. (1361), as to whom see *Dugd. Bar.* i. 447. The register of interments and sepulchral inscriptions in the church of the Grey Friars, London, printed in the fifth volume of *Collectanea Topogr. et Geneal.* (the entry is at p. 278.), which I presume to be the authority for Knight's *London*, does not afford further information as to this lady, who is reckoned amongst the four queens said by Weever (following Stowe) to have been interred in this church. Mr. J. G. Nichols, in his note to the entry referred to, does not add any information about the Lady Isabel.

There was a Sybil, who was daughter of William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury and King of Man and Derby, one of the most distinguished characters in the heroic age of Edward III. She married Edmund, the younger of the two sons of Edmund Earl of Arundel, by Alice, sister and heir of John, last Earl of Warren and Surrey, who died in 1347 (*Dugd. Bar.* i. 82.). William Montacute was created Earl of Salisbury 16th March, 1337, and died in 1343, and was entombed in the church of the Friars Carmelites, London (*Weever*, 437.). He was connected with the family of John Earl of Surrey; for it appears from a grant made by the king in 11 Edward III. to William Earl of Salisbury, that he was entitled in reversion to certain hereditaments then held by John de Warren, Earl of Surrey, and Joan his wife (*Collect. Top. et Gen.* vii. 379.). The valiant Montacute, lord of Man, did not die without heirs male, for his son William was his heir; otherwise we might have supposed the dominion of the isle to have devolved on his daughter Sybil or Isabel, who, surviving Edmund her hus-

band, may have married the Lord Fitz-Warine. Can evidence of such connexion be found? I have not met with anything to connect his family with the lordship of the Isle of Man, and am not aware that "Isabel Queen of Man" is mentioned in any record save the sepulchral register of the Grey Friars. I wish some clue could be found to a satisfactory answer.

The other branch of the question, When did the Isle of Man cease to be an independent kingdom? can be answered by a short historical statement. So early as the reign of John, its sovereigns rendered fealty and homage to the kings of England. Reginald, styled King of Man, did homage to Henry III., as appears by the extract given from the *Rot. Par.* 3 Hen. III., by Selden. During a series of years previously, the kings of Man, who seem to have held this isle together with the Hebrides, had done homage to the kings of Norway, and its bishops went to Drontheim for consecration. Magnus, last sovereign of Man of the Norwegian dynasty, died in 1265. From that period the shadowy crown of Man is seen from time to time resting on lords of different races, and its descent is in many periods involved in great obscurity. After the death of Magnus, the island was seized by Alexander III. of Scotland. A daughter and heiress of Reginald sued for it against John Baliol before Edward I. of England as lord paramount of Man (*Rot. Parl.* 31 Edw. I.). In 35 Edw. I., we find Anthony Bek, the warlike Bishop and Count Palatine of Durham, in possession of the isle; but the king of England then claimed to resume it into his own hands, as of the ancient right of the crown. Accordingly, from sundry records it appears that Edw. II. and Edw. III. committed its custody to various persons; and the latter king at length conferred his right to it upon William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, in consideration, probably, of that valiant earl having by his arms regained the island from the Scots, who had resumed possession, and of the circumstance that his grandmother, the wife of Simon de Montacute, was sister and heiress of one of the former kings of Man, and

related to the lady who had claimed it as her inheritance on the death of Magnus. The son and heir of the grantee sold the isle to Scrope, Earl of Wiltshire, about 16 Rich. II. In the time of Hen. IV. Sir William Scrope forfeited his possessions (*Dugd. Bar.* ii. 250.); and the isle again came to the crown. It was granted to Percy, Earl of Northumberland, by the service of bearing the Lancaster sword on the left shoulder of the king on the day of coronation; was forfeited by Percy; and was thereupon granted by the same king to Sir John Stanley and his heirs, under which grant the Earls of Derby succeeded during many years. It was a subject of a grant to the Stanleys by Queen Elizabeth, and of an act of parliament in the reign of James I., under which the isle became vested in the Duchess Dowager of Athol, as heir of the body of James, seventh Earl of Derby, and ultimately became vested by purchase in the crown. It may be said, that during the time of authentic history, the Isle of Man was not an independent kingdom, until the regality was granted by the crown, as already mentioned.—Wm. Sidney Gibson.—(ii. p. 132.)

Mr. Wm. Sidney Gibson has correctly referred to the authority for this designation; but it may be well, before pursuing the inquiry, to place before the reader the very words of the register of the Grey Friars of London:

"Versus quasi medium chori jacet dominus Willelmus Fitzwarryn Baro, et Isabella uxor sua quondam Regina Man."—*Collectanea Top. et Geneal.* v. 278.

Mr. Gibson has also correctly added, that in my note to this entry I have not afforded any information about the lady Isabel. It is true that I searched for such information in vain; and the information I gave in lieu was the date of the death of William Lord Fitz-Warine, viz., the 35 Edw. III. (1361), and the name of the lady he is known from record (Ex. 22 Edw. III. no. 39.) to have married, namely, *Amicia*, daughter and heir of Sir Henry de Haddon. As there is not the slightest ground for imagining that this Amicia was ever "Queen of Man," it must therefore be

concluded, supposing that the register of the Grey Friars gives a faithful reflection of the epitaph, that the Lord Fitz-Warine had a second wife. I am not inclined to adopt Mr. Gibson's suggestion that this lady was *Sibilla*, daughter of William de Montacute, first Earl of Salisbury, because the lordship of Man descended to the second earl, and he possessed it until the 16 Ric. II. (1393). It seems therefore that the only "Queen of Man" that could be the wife of William Lord Fitz-Warine, must have been the widow of the first Earl of Salisbury, who died in 1343. The wife of that earl and the mother of his heir was *Katharine*, daughter of William Lord Granson, as Mr Beltz gives that name, correcting the more prevalent form of Grandison. The question therefore to be decided is — Did this lady survive him, or did he marry a second wife named *Isabella?* In either case, I think it is clear that the lady buried at the Grey Friars was the Dowager Countess of Salisbury. Mr. Beltz has given a memoir of Sir William Fitz-Warine in his *Memorials of the Garter*, but he was not aware of the baron's connexion with "the Queen of Man." Dying of the plague on the 28th Oct. 1361, it was probably in haste that his body was interred in the church of the Grey Friars, and the queen may have fallen a victim to the same pestilence. There is an effigy in the church at Wantage which is ascribed to this Lord Fitz-Warine; and it is accompanied by one of a lady, probably Amicia Haddon, on whose death, some time before his own, that monument may have been erected. These effigies are engraved in the series by Hollis. There is a peculiarity attending the barony of this William Fitz-Warine. He was first summoned by writ in 1342 [qu. if 1343, and thus after his marriage with the Dowager Countess of Salisbury?]; and though he left a son and heir, Sir Ivo Fitz-Warine, that son was never summoned to parliament. A similar course has been observed in other cases where the title to a barony was *jure uxoris*, in which condition may be included the state of the second husband of a countess, there being instances of men in that position being summoned to parliament *as barons*, whilst the count-

esses their wives were living, and no longer. Thus it is possible that Fitz-Warine was summoned, because he had married the countess and "queen;" and his son Ivo was not summoned, because he was the son of Amicia Haddon.

With regard to the titles of King or Queen of Man, they do not appear to be recognised by records, but merely by the chroniclers. Dugdale has quoted from the history of Thomas de la Mare, that William, Earl of Salisbury, having in 16 Edw. III. (1342) conquered the Isle of Man (from the Scots), the king gave him the inheritance, and *crowned him king thereof;* and Walsingham and Otterbourne (p. 153.) relate that the Vice-Chamberlaine, Sir William Scrope, in 16 Ric. II. (1393), purchased the sovereignty of the Isle of Man *cum coronâ*. But the word *dominus*, not *rex*, is employed in Latin records, and *seigneur* in French. On the seal of the first Earl of Salisbury he is styled *dominus de dynbi et mannie*, and on his counter-seal *dominus de man et de dynbi;* and on a counter or privy seal of the second earl he is styled *dominus mannie et de dynbi* (*i. e.* Denbigh, not "Derby," as misprinted *antea*). These seals have been recently engraved in the Salisbury volume of the Archæological Institute. The second earl in his will, made the 20th April, 1397, styles himself "Earl of Salisbury and Lord of the Isles of Man and Wiht," although he had then sold the lordship of Man some years before. In the Harleian charters is a bond from the purchaser to the famous Sir Richard Whityngton, citizen and mercer of London, dated 29th Aug. 1393, in which he is described as "William le Scrope, Seigneur de Man et des Isles;" and in the truce with France on the 10th March, 1394, "Monsieur Gwilliam le Scrope" is recorded to have assented to the proceedings "pour le seigneury de Man," as one of the *allies* of the King of England. (*Fœdera*, iii. part iv. p. 95.) It is not easy to determine when or where these potent subjects really assumed the rank or title of "king" and "queen;" and it must be recollected that the King of England himself was at the same period content to call himself

only "Lord of Ireland," as the Earl of Salisbury was "Lord of Man."

It may stimulate Mr. Gibson, as a north countryman, to further researches in this matter, to remind him that it is to Katharine, Countess of Salisbury, at the Castle of Wark in Northumberland, that Mr. Beltz has traced the anecdote related by Froissart of the especial admiration which King Edward III. conceived for a Countess of Salisbury; connected with which are some of the legendary stories of the origin of the Order of the Garter (see *Memorials of the Garter*, pp. 63. et seq.). It would be a remarkable fact to ascertain that the object of the king's gallantry became afterwards even a nominal queen.

JOHN GOUGH NICHOLS.—(vol. v. p. 205.)

In an interesting communication from MR. WM. SIDNEY GIBSON in a late Number of your publication there occurs the following statement, to which I beg to add a few remarks. He says:

"After the death of Magnus, the island was seized by Alexander III. of Scotland. A daughter and heiress of Reginald sued for it against John Baliol, before Edward I. of England, as lord paramount of Man.—*Rot. Parl.*, 31 Edw. I."

And farther on he states:

"From sundry records it appears that Edward II. and Edward III. committed its custody to various persons, and the latter at length conferred his right to it upon William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, in consideration, probably, of that valiant earl having by his arms regained the island from the Scots, who had resumed possession, and of the circumstance that his grandmother, the wife of Simon de Montacute, was sister and heiress of one of the former kings of Man, and related to the lady who had claimed it as her inheritance on the death of Magnus."

Now, I think MR. GIBSON, on reflection, will agree with me in concluding that the wife of Simon de Montacute, and the lady who claimed the island on the death of Magnus, were one and the same person. There is no document, I believe, of the kind he refers to, of the "31st" of Edw. I.; but in the "21st" of Edw. I., which date is probably in-

tended, there is amongst the Scotch Rolls (anno 21 Edw. I., m. 4.) a citation from Edward I., as supreme lord of Scotland, directed to John Baliol, King of Scots, to answer the complaint of *Aufrica*, cousin and heiress of Magnus, late King of Man, &c. This is in the year 1292-3; and a few years later we again meet with *Aufrica*, for amongst the ancient charters in the British Museum is one marked "V. 73." It is a deed by which "*Aufrica*, heiress of the land of Man," gives up her right therein, "to her noble and potent husband, Simon de Montagu." This deed is dated at Bridgewater, on Thursday the Vigil of the Annunciation, 1305; *i. e.* March 24, 1306.

In this charter (V. 73.) she calls herself *Aufrica de Connought:* and this is rather curious, for in a volume of pedigrees in the British Museum, in the handwriting of Robert Glover, Somerset Herald (Bib. Harl. 807.), she is said to be the daughter of Fergus, Lord of Galloway (Galway ?), and Queen of Man. *Galway* it is in another MS. in the same collection (MSS. Harl. 1074. folio 22.), where she is styled "Aufrica, Reyne de Man," and daughter of Fergus, Lord of Galway. In both these MSS. she is said to be the wife of Simon de Montagu, who is styled "Roy de Man par sa femme." F. C. M.—(vol. v. p. 234.)

ANECDOTE OF CHARLES I.

The following anecdote is extracted from a small paper book, purchased some fifty years since, at Newport, in the Isle of Wight, which contains the history of a family named Douglas, for some years resident in that town, written by the last representative, Eliza Douglas, at the sale of whose effects it came into my grandfather's hands. There are many curious particulars in it; especially an account of the writer's great-great-grandfather (the husband of the heroine of this tale), who "traded abroad, and was took into Turkey as a slave," and there gained the affections of his master's daughter, after the most approved old-ballad fashion; though, alas! it was not to her love that he

owed his liberty, but (dreadful bathos!) to his skill in cooking fowls, &c. &c. in the English taste;" which, on a certain occasion, when some English merchants came to dine with his master, "so pleased the company, that they offered to redeem him, which was accepted; and when freed he came home to England, and lived in London to an advanced age; so old that they fed him with a tea-spoon."

After his death his wife married again; and it was during this second marriage that the interview with King Charles took place.

"My mother's great-grandmother, when a-breeding with her daughter, Mary Craige, which was at ye time of *King Charles* being a *prisoner* in *Carisbrook Castle*, she longed to kiss the King's *hand*; and when he was brought to Newport to be carried off, she being acquainted with the gentleman's housekeeper, where the King was coming to stay, till orders for him to leave the island, she went to the housekeeper, told her what she wanted, and they contrived for her to come the morning he was to go away. So up she got, and dressed herself, and set off to call her midwife, and going along, the first and second guard stopped her and asked her where she was going; she told them 'to call her midwife,' which she did. They went to this lady, and she went and acquainted his Majesty with the affair; he desired she may come up to him, and she said, when she came into the room, his Majesty seemed to appear as if he had been at *prayers*. He rose up and came to her, who fell on her knees before him; he took her up by the arm himself, and put his *cheek* to her, and she said she gave him a good hearty smack on his cheek. His Majesty then said, 'Pray God bless you, and that you go withal.' She then went down stairs to wait and see the King take coach; she got so close that she saw a gentleman in it; and when the King stept into the coach, he said, 'Pray, Sir, what is your name?' he replied, 'I am Col. Pride.' 'Not miscalled,' says the King. Then Pride says, 'Drive on, coachman.'"

E. V.

THE INQUISITION.

The Inquisition in all its proceedings, except those by which it celebrated its triumphs in the public *autos*, has ever shrouded itself in mysterious secresy. In the want of

correct intelligence relating to it, many groundless and improbable stories have found a ready reception with uninformed persons, if only related with a show of authority, how unsubstantial soever the truth of them may prove to be. That some respectable writers have lent their pens to the circulation of such mistakes, and in some degree mischievous accounts, shows a want of care to verify the facts they narrate to their readers, or reflects more seriously upon their zeal, too eager in its conflict with error to pause a moment to consider whether their erroneous statements may not injure the truth it is generally intended to support. Not a little currency has thus been given to a story about the destruction of the palace of the Inquisition of Madrid, which, as it will appear, must be classed with childish legend or German romance.

It is in substance as follows: — That when Napoleon Buonaparte penetrated into Spain in 1809, he ordered the buildings of the Inquisition to be destroyed; that Col. Lemanousky, of the Polish Lancers, being at Madrid, reminded Marshal Soult of this order, and obtained from him the 117th regiment, commanded by Col. De Lisle, for its execution; that the building, situated a short distance from Madrid, was in point of strength a fortress of itself, garrisoned by soldiers of the Holy Office, who being quickly overpowered, and the place taken, the Inquisitor-General, with a number of priests in their official robes, were made prisoners. That they found the apartments splendidly furnished with altars, crucifixes, and candles in abundance; but could find no places of torture, dungeons, or prisoners, until Col. De Lisle thought of testing the floor by floating it with water, when a seam was thus discovered through which it escaped below; and the marble slab being struck by the butt end of a musket, a spring raised it up, and revealed a staircase leading down to the Hall of Judgment below. That there they found cells for prisoners, some empty, some tenanted by living victims, some by corpses in a state of decay, and some with life but lately departed from them; that the living prisoners, being naked, were

partially clothed by the French soldiers and liberated, amounting to one hundred in number. That they found there all kinds of instruments of torture, which so exasperated the French, that they could not be restrained from exercising them upon the captive inquisitors; Col. De Lisle standing by whilst four different kinds were applied, and then leaving the apartment in disgust; and finally, that when the inmates had been removed, Col. De Lisle went to Madrid, obtained gunpowder, placed it in the vaults of the building, and lighting a slow match, made a joyful sight to thousands of spectators. "The walls and massive turrets of that dark edifice were lifted towards the heavens, and the Inquisition of Madrid was no more."

Now this attractive and romantic narrative of vindicated liberty, justice, and charity, must take its place among other unsubstantial and amusing fictions. The story, as far as I have been able to trace it, originates in a relation said to have been made by Col. Lemanousky, whilst in the United States of America, to a Mr. Killog of Illinois, who published it in the *Western Luminary*. A refugee Pole, and a back-states newspaper!

It is copied with more or less detail into various publications, which in this manner add a sanction of their own to its pretended authenticity. Not to mention various recent periodicals and newspapers, it appears in *The Mystery Unveiled, or Popery as its Dogmas and Pretensions appear in the Light of Reason, the Bible, and History*, by the Rev. James Bell, Edinburgh, 1834, at p. 424., quoting from the *Christian Treasury*, a Scotch periodical: — Ferreal (M. de V.), *Mystères de l'Inquisition et autres Sociétés secrètes d'Espagne, avec notes historiques, et une introduction de M. Manuel de Cuendias*, Paris, 1845, 8vo., at pp. 79—84.: —*The Inquisition, &c.*, Dublin, 1850, pp. 209—214.: after giving the story at length, with some colouring, the writer adds, that "the Holy Catholic Church in this, as in other things, was grossly misrepresented:" a remark perhaps ingeniously introduced to cast a doubt upon all the

circumstances in the volume, true as well as untrue ; thus to render error and truth undistinguishable : — *The Curse of Christendom, or the Spirit of Popery Exhibited and Exposed*, by the Rev. J. B. Pike, 1852, 8vo., at pp. 261—264.

It is strange that such respectable writers never thought of consulting the current histories of the Peninsular war, or the leading newspapers of the time — *The Courier* and *Morning Chronicle*— which could scarcely have passed so public an event by without recording it ; and that they did not mistrust the tale from the silence of Llorente and Puigblanch, who would certainly have mentioned it ; for neither the ex-secretary of the tribunal, nor Sn. Puigblanch, who first published his *Inquisicion sin Mascára* at Cadiz in 1811, and occupied the Hebrew Professor's chair in the central university of Madrid in 1820-1, could have remained ignorant of such a consummating circumstance. Neglecting the pains to verify the fact, they have left in their pages a striking instance, for an intelligent opponent to point at, of simple credulity and the unsubstantial worth of their books.

In 1808, Napoleon decreed the suppression of the Tribunals of the Inquisition, at Chamartin, a village one league from Madrid, at a house of the Duke del Infantado's, where he lodged. They were again established by a decree of Ferdinand VII. on July 21, 1814 ; and again suppressed by the constitutional government of 1820. There were two houses of the Inquisition at Madrid, and they still exist. Marshal Soult did not command at Madrid, nor is it true that he ordered their demolition. The front and appearance of one of them has been altered only four or five years ago, but it was not pulled down. Whoever will take the trouble to look at the plan of Madrid, published for sixpence by the Society of Useful Knowledge, may see near the north-west corner, not far from the new Royal Palace, a shaded spot, stretching from the Calle ancha de San Bernardo to the Calle de la Inquisicion, which opens into the Plazuela de San Domingo. That spot marks the

principal building of the Inquisition at Madrid; there was none beyond the town. It is one of the most substantial edifices, erected upon a granite basement; and, judging from some gratings seen from the street, having underground apartments rarely found in that capital.

To substitute truth for fiction, we may here give a more trustworthy statement than that before quoted. It is from a gentleman who really inspected this house of the Inquisition at Madrid in March, 1820, when that evil sanhedrim was legally suppressed. The relator, an eye-witness, was no inventor of marvellous and doleful stories to defame it; neither had he, we may be sure, asked for its restitution, like the Duke de Bailen. His account is as follows:

"At the change of the absolute government of Ferdinand VII. for the constitutional rule of the Cortes, on the 7th of March, 1820, the Tribunal of the Inquisition was legally suppressed. The people of Madrid, more from curiosity than a well-judging hatred, flocked in a crowd to see and examine the building. It was found in the street known by its odious name, entering by the right-hand from the Plazuela de San Domingo, communicating at the back with the Dominican Convent del Rosario in the Calle ancha de San Bernardo, that leads to the gate of Fuencaral, without which was the Quemadero, or burning-place. There was a communication from the building to the Dominican Convent by a subterraneous passage, as appeared by that we passed through. Whether inquisitorial cruelty had been less active since 1814 than before the French invasion, or that the instruments of torture had been removed, the fact was, that nothing was now found except traces which proved the use of them.

"By the recommendation of Don Rodrigo de Aranda, second alcalde at that time, who was commissioned to collect the effects, books, and papers remaining there, torches were provided to enable us to penetrate the darkness of the passages below ground. Externally, the building presented nothing remarkable. We went in from the street by a large gateway; a little to the right was the door of entrance, large and massive, approached by five or six stone steps. Crossing a short, wide, and dark passage, and descending more steps than were at the first door, we came out into a large *patio*, or inner court, without corredores round it, as are usual in such cases. Access was reached to the first floor by several staircases, some wide, some narrow, that, by intricate communications one with another, led, some to the halls of the Tribunal, and some to the places of imprison-

ment. Here these, in general, were roomy; with lofty ceilings and windows more than two feet square, placed at a considerable height from the floor. Every prison had a very solid outer door, braced with strong ironwork. When these were opened, a small cell about four feet square was found within the apartment, formed of solid masonry. In the right-hand wall of this was a grating of strong iron bars about an inch square; and opposite the first door of entrance was another very solid door with a similar iron grating. By this means the jailor, by only opening the first door, could review everything within the whole circle of the apartment. These were distinguished by the names of certain prisoners who had been confined in them; such as Friar's Prison, the Beata Clara's, Juan Van Halen's, and others.

"Returned to the ground-floor in order to descend to the vaults, the Señora Marquesa de B—— shrank back in terror; but the flambeaux being lighted by her footman, and again reassured, we descended above thirty steps, and found ourselves in an apartment some twenty feet square; entirely empty, and dimly lighted by a skylight from the ground of the *patio*, or inner court. The floor was firm and level; but perceiving half-way along the wall, where the light from the court struck upon it, a moveable part, we examined the spot by the light of the torches; and found at the height of some seven feet from the floor, two large wooden plugs firmly bedded in the wall in a line with each other. In one of them a large iron ring, much rusted, of the thickness of a finger, still remained. The inference is, that it was a kind of torture, by fixing the wrists of the victim to the two rings, and removing the part of the floor below; so not being able to feel his feet at that height, he would be left suspended by the wrists. After examining several other apartments containing nothing worthy of notice, we entered one through a breach that we found made through the thick masonry of the entrance cell, such as before described in the upper prisons. This was a very roomy parallelogram, and its floor, although tolerably firm, was very damp; so much so that we thrust a walking-stick into it, without any great force, up to the handle, and drew it out whitened, as though it had passed through moist chalk. Opposite the place we entered stood an altar; the whole square shaft of it, and the step below, of yellow marble; and on the steps were many droppings from wax candles. We could find no image, crucifix, or painting of any kind, nor aperture where this vault could have received light, nor could we discover the proper entrance to it. On the point of leaving, we perceived a kind of large window-shutter at one corner, about five feet from the floor. It opened without difficulty, and we found a square space which led down to a well or sunken shaft. To

prove whether it was so, we rolled a fragment of masonry into it. It returned no splash of water, but a heavy sound like a blow upon wood, followed by a lengthened creaking noise, as if of a trap-door opened reluctantly. Withdrawing from this frightful spot, the footman, who carried the torches, picked up a rib of metal from the floor, one of the pair that form the compass legs of a lady's fan, by which it is opened and folded. The metal was so corroded, that it crumbled between the fingers. A singular thing to find in such a place, having no communication from the street or from the inner court. Leaving this dismal part of the edifice, we took a staircase that, after a descent of twenty steps, ended in a passage about a yard wide, and something like forty feet long; terminating in another shorter one that formed with this a cross, or head line of the letter T. In the left-hand arm of this cross was a large square funnel; on the upper part of it, on each side, were fixed iron spikes, in the manner that gardeners call *quincunx*. The damp and chilness of this underground vault were most distressing to our feelings; and fearing that the torches might become extinguished, and ourselves left in total darkness, we hastened back by the passage through which we entered; noticing that in this passage there were on each side recesses, or very narrow cells, the frames of the doorways alone remaining. We found by a plumbline, sunk from stage to stage, that these fearful and noisome cells were fifty feet below the ground of the principal court."

This is the record of the house of the Inquisition at Madrid, from the remembrance, after the lapse of thirty years, of one whose character and simple manners avouch its credibility; and whose name, if it might be given, would confirm it.

Several of the authors of the volumes, useful and instructive as they are in their general subject, into whose pages the story has found an introduction, have, we are fully persuaded, no wish to mislead or merely amuse their readers with a romantic fiction; and we can suppose that a narrative concerning an institution so mysteriously shrouded as that of the Inquisition, might, not without some apparent reason, though incautiously and without examination, be taken up by them. Still they furnish the advocates of intolerance with a ready argument against the reception of what can be authentically proved; they divert the mind from the apprehension of larger wrongs than those of individual suffering, shocking as they are; they hold forth a

false security that this evil was destroyed, which is even now weaving its toils anew. That thundercloud still threatens which has for three long centuries shaded the best genius of whole nations in religion, in social arts, in practical science; and they, the brightest people in Europe. Its influence through successive generations has inflicted a bad *instinct* upon a race,—the *instinct of mistrust* between rulers and people, priest and worshipper, man and man — even between the nearest ties of relationship; and isolating man prevents cooperation and reliance on one another in spontaneous combinations for mutual benefit. It has destroyed *faith* in a double sense. That motive or principle, formed of free and willing belief, and complete and spontaneous trust of the whole mind, which, when exercised in religion, we call *faith*, when applied to the physical sciences, has, through confidence and co-operation, formed railways, tunnelled rivers, bored through mountains, and despatched our very words and wishes on the wings of lightning. It is one of the lasting and greatest crimes of the Inquisition, that it has destroyed this principle in countries where its power prevailed; and it may be evident to any one, that this must remain the latest among the Christian commonwealth, to exercise native invention, and to apply it in the triumph of mind over matter for their own and the world's incalculable advantage.

B. B. Wiffen.—(vol. x. pp. 122. 137.)

Lord Monson, vol. x. p. 246., writes as follows:

Having been at Madrid in the October of 1820, and visited the building of the Inquisition, I was desirous to see if my own impressions agreed with those in Mr. Wiffen's interesting communication. The following is a short abstract of my notes.

On the right hand, in the Calle de l'Inquisition, was a ruinous brick building; certainly not the vast-looking, massive, or imposing structure that romance readers would have pictured to themselves as the seat of the Inquisition. We were told that the populace, in the first fury of the late revolution, had gutted the interior; but our curiosity

would not be satisfied without a personal inspection. We then found that the contracted frontage gave an erroneous impression of the size; for the building extended backwards to a great length, and the passages and vaults underground also occupied considerable space.

The subterraneous prisons were the first we entered, small cells (on each side of a long passage) about six feet long, and barely high enough to admit standing upright. The damp was horrible. The people had turned up the floor in every dungeon, for the purpose, as alleged, of seeing if any prisoners had been buried beneath. There were other prisons less revolting, not being so contracted, and receiving light through a grating. The chamber of suspicion, *i. e.* for persons only suspected, was on one side of an interior court, and had a grated window high in the wall.

We were shown several chambers of torture, each being adapted to some different device. They were all underground, without light, and removed as much as possible from human hearing. All the instruments of torture were now, our guides said, locked up in the upper rooms of the building. They volunteered information of what had been, which must be taken for what it may be worth. In one chamber they pointed out the place where an instrument had been fixed, by which the sufferer, being pinioned to the wall, underwent the torture of water dropping slowly and regularly on the head till he expired. Close by this had been a machine worked by mechanism, where a hammer repeated gentle blows on the temples till the same effect was produced. In another vault a seat was placed between four stoves, to which the accused being fixed, underwent the punishment of slow roasting. A niche in a third room was asserted to be for the purpose of walling up alive. In several chambers there were beams still existing which the guides declared were used for suspending the unfortunates by the arms or legs. Lastly, we entered what was called the Campo Santo, which was a vaulted room larger than the rest, and used for the burial of the

victims. We were forced to creep into this place by a hole in the wall, for the narrow staircase which led down into it had been closed by order of government. The ground here was turned up in every direction in the search for bodies after the revolution. In one of the most interior courts, about ten feet square, into which no window opened, and which, at the depth of this lofty building, looked more like the bottom of a well, the prisoner allowed to take the air was turned out to pace round and round. We suspected great exaggeration in what our guides said about the number of inmates that had been released, and never obtained any authentic information on this point.

So far my notes assist me; and at this distance of time I do not choose to add anything from memory. The apartment named to us as the Campo Santo, is corroborated as to its purpose by the description of Mr. Wiffen's informant, who visited it six months previous to us; but the altar in that time seems to have been removed. The moist chalk he speaks of was probably the quicklime used at burials. The trap-door we were not shown.

These notes produced the following communication, signed Uneda.

The attack made upon Col. Lehmanowsky in the first of the above articles having been republished in the United States, that gentleman, who has been for many years a clergyman of the Lutheran Church in this country, has taken notice of it in the following letter to the editor of the *Independent*, a religious newspaper published in the city of New York.

Letter from Colonel Lehmanowsky.

Hamburg, Clark co. Indiana,
Dec. 15, 1854.

Mr. Editor of the Independent,

A few days ago, a gentleman gave me to read an article, published in a London (England) periodical, called *Notes and Queries*, in which a writer criticised my statement about the destruction of the Inquisition Chemastin, near Madrid,

in Spain. In perusing this article, my first intention was not to take notice of it, and let it pass for what it is worth. But yesterday, a friend of mine handed me your paper, *The Independent*, in which my attention was drawn to an article signed "Inquirer." In said article I am called a "Polish refugee;" whereas, the Polish refugees came in this country only in 1833; whilst I came after the battle of Waterloo, in 1816, and have had the honour, since 1821, to be a citizen of these United States.

Secondly, the gentleman says that in the year 1814 the king of Spain re-established the "Inquisition," and in 1820 he or his friend saw that massive building yet standing, and therefore I must have made a false statement about its being blown up. It seems the learned gentleman thinks it needs to rebuild an "Inquisition" as long as it needed to build St. Peter's at Rome, and in eleven years time it could not be rebuilded, as it was blown up in 1809 by the troops under my command. May be, if the gentleman would go to Moscow, in Russia, at the present time, he will likewise say, Moscow has never been burned, and the Kremlin had never been blown up by powder in 1812, because, he would say, the houses are all standing, and the "massive" buildings in the Kremlin are there.

Thirdly, this kind gentleman says that Marshal Soult was not the Commandant of Madrid. Who said so? not I. My statement is, that Count Mejolès was the Commandant, but Marshal Soult the Military Commander of the division, which not only occupied Madrid, but twenty or thirty miles round about Madrid.

And now, Mr. Editor, I think I have done so far my duty in answering this very learned gentleman, who made the criticism in the *Notes and Queries*. But allow me to remark, that I am astonished that any one should wait twenty years since my first statement, to correct the same. It seems to me that those who were always wishing to have this statement hushed up, waited until they were sure Marshal Soult and Col. De Lisle were dead, and no doubt suspected Col. Lehmanowsky was also numbered among

the dead, so that they may have free play; but they are mistaken.

I will only add, as the Lord has blessed me to be nearly eighty-two years of age, they should wait a little longer, until they are sure that none are living who took part in the destruction of the "Inquisition Chemastin."

In conclusion, let me inform you, Mr. Editor, that it is (with the help of God) my firm resolution to write no more on this subject, as I am advanced in age, and can employ my time a great deal better to do the work of my Captain of Salvation, Jesus Christ, in preaching His Gospel to saints and sinners.

I remain, with due regard, your obedient servant,

J. J. Lehmanowsky.

In consequence of Uneda's letter Mr. Wiffen addressed the following interesting communication to "N. & Q." in confirmation of his former statement.

In my former article a description is given of the house of the General Inquisition of Madrid, at the time when the tribunal was suppressed in 1820; and censure is passed upon certain writers, English and French, for giving currency to a fictitious story of the demolition of a palace of the Inquisition near Madrid, in 1809, by the French troops under Marshal Soult. The story appeared to have been adopted by those writers successively, from a narrative purporting to have been made by Col. Lehmanowsky, and printed in a United States newspaper. In Vol. x., p. 246., appear some additional particulars relating to the house of the Inquisition, the result of personal inspection in the year 1820, from the pen of Lord Monson; and in Vol. xi., p. 108., is a communication from Philadelphia to the "N. & Q.," giving the copy of a letter addressed from Hamburg, Clark co. Indiana, to the editor of the *Independent*, a New York religious newspaper, written from J. J. Lehmanowsky himself, endeavouring to support the credibility of the story put forth in his name; into which newspaper it would seem that the first article, or some part of it, had been inserted

from the "N. & Q." His letter mystifies and confounds the re-establishment of the Inquisition as an *institution*, which was suppressed in 1809, and restored to power in 1814, with the (supposed) reconstruction of an edifice asserted to have been destroyed. And again resting, it would seem, his apocryphal "Destruction of the Inquisition Chemastin" on the circumstance that a decree suppressing the Inquisition as an institution was issued by Napoleon in 1808, during his temporary residence, from a house of the Duque del Infantado's, at Chamartin, near Madrid; an edifice yet standing, and in the gardens of which, in 1851, was growing the staple production of the United States—the cotton-plant, producing its flossy down and ripened seed. An "Inquisition Chemastin" never had existence.

It will have been readily perceived by every candid reader of the first article, that its purpose was not personal, as Mr. Lehmanowsky by his letter would seem to infer; it was a correction of the too easy adoption by some writers on the Romish controversy of a narrative to which they had lent the authority of their names, copying one from another without seeking cotemporary proofs. Hence a story that might afford an hour's amusement in the columns of the newspaper where it first appeared, like any similar *novelette*, seemed not improbable, by the currency so given it, to become in this country an established *fiction historical*, and to return to the United States whence it came, with a more authentic impression upon it than at first it possessed. What efforts are made by the best writers to clear away the fables of history already adopted! Is it not, then, the moral duty of an enlightened age to supply the following one with materials for historic veracity? That is no generous enthusiasm for liberty and religious truth which would needlessly increase its future perplexity. In works of imagination, it may be considered a high species of merit to adapt the facts of history in the most perfect manner to Romance; but the best interests of literature are concerned in preventing the adaptation of undistinguishable romance to history. And as a certain sense of mystery envelopes

everything relating to the Inquisition, which excites the imagination by its secrecy, it may be worth while to reply to Mr. Lehmanowsky's defence of his story, by producing here evidence of a more formal kind than the issue of a question of mere literary and historical interest might otherwise seem to require.

This can fortunately be done from a set of papers now before me, officially drawn up, witnessed and signed, confirming the statements made in the first article as to the fabulous character of the said story. It would be scarcely suitable to occupy the columns of the "N. & Q." with a literal transcript of these papers and their technicalities; it may be sufficient to give a summary of the declarations here, as the originals, when they have served their purpose, will probably be deposited in one of the great public libraries.

The case opens with a statement of the subject-matter made as follows: — That in 1850, a book was published in Dublin, printed for Philip Dixon Hardy & Sons, entitled *The Inquisition, its History, Influence, and Effects.* That in this volume of 250 pages, from pp. 209. to 214., is inserted an account of the demolition of the palace of the Inquisition (near Madrid) in the year 1809, by order of Marshal Soult, as related by the commanding officer who destroyed the palace. That this account is altogether romantic and fabulous, and is censured as such in pp. 20, 21. of an appendix to a Spanish work by Gonzales de Montes, printed in 1851: that, trusting to the correctness of this appendix, the censure was extracted and printed (with remarks to the same purpose) in a London literary periodical, called "NOTES AND QUERIES;" but that a gentleman named J. J. Lehmanowsky has written a letter in the United States, published in the "N. & Q.," re-affirming the certainty of the facts; and adding in his letter, that having arrived at the age of eighty, he shall take no trouble to correct or reply to any farther remarks on the subject; and that, as the assertions of this gentleman tend to belie

the statements made in the appendix to the work by Montes, it is thought proper to establish their correctness by the corroborative testimonies of several respectable and truthful persons; in order to place before him and others conclusive proofs that all the incidents of his story are fictitious.

Hence it is here demonstrated, that the following assertions are untrue: — 1. That a house of the Inquisition existed in 1809, with walls and turrets of solid construction, five miles from Madrid. 2. That it was defended by armed guards in the service of the Inquisitors. 3. That it was handsomely furnished, having also paintings and a library. 4. That the Inquisitor-General had his residence there. 5. That three regiments of French troops, under Marshal Soult, went to demolish it; and that they mined and blew it up, with a tremendous explosion. On the contrary, it is certain, that there never were more houses for the use of the Inquisition of Madrid than one, recently built in the Calle de Maria Cristina, No. 4. nuevo; and another where the Inquisitor-General resided, still existing in the Calle de Torija, No. 14. neuvo, opposite the present residence of Lord Howden, the English ambassador.

Firstly, D. F. A——, Knight of the Order of Carlos III., &c. born, resident, and a proprietor in Madrid, aged sixty-four, living in the Plazuela ——, appeared before the judge and notary; declared that he understood the subject-matter, and offered his positive declaration, that the relation is false that there had been in 1809 a house of the Inquisition five miles distant from Madrid, neither at Chamartin, solidly constructed with walls and turrets, or defended by guards in the service of the Inquisitors. That it is untrue that three regiments of French troops went to demolish it, mining and blowing it up; because there never were more houses, for the use of the Inquisition of Madrid, than one, recently rebuilt in the Calle de Maria Cristina, No. 4. nuevo; and another, still retaining its ancient form, in the Calle de Torija, No. 14. nuevo, where the Inquisitor-General lived; and this stands opposite the house now oc-

cupied by the English ambassador, Lord Howden. That as to the furniture, pictures, and library, he is ignorant; but if these were supposed to be in a house of the Inquisition five miles from Madrid, the assertion is fabulous; because there never existed such an one. That he can truly make this declaration, because, in the year 1809, he had been residing at Madrid from his birth; that he well knew the two buildings belonging to the Inquisition; and that he never saw the guards or heard of the supposed demolition, which, if it had occurred, must have come to his knowledge: and this declaration, made under oath, being read over, he ratifies it.

Secondly, D. J. G. V——, born at Villafranca, resident at Madrid, Calle de ——, formerly holding an appointment in the department of Receipts of Espolios, since suppressed, aged eighty-four, appeared, and stated that he understood the subject. That the story is fictitious that there was, in 1809, a house of the Inquisition five miles from Madrid, neither at Chamartin, walled, turreted, and defended by guards; that three regiments of French troops, under Marshal Soult, went to destroy it, mining and blowing it up. That the Inquisition of Madrid never had more than two houses; one now rebuilt in the Calle de Cristina, No. 4. nuevo; and another in the Calle de Torija, No. 14. nuevo, where the Inquisitor-General resided, opposite the house occupied by the present English ambassador, Lord Howden. That he can declare this without the shadow of a doubt; because, in 1809, the period referred to, he attended daily at his office in the suppressed department of Receipts of Espolios, which was held at that time, and continued to be held down to the summer of 1811, in the Calle de Leganitos; the first house on the right, entering by the Plazuela de Santo Domingo, in the immediate neighbourhood of the said houses of the Inquisition, their situation and appearance being well known to him; that they never were fortified; that he never saw armed guards, or heard the supposed ruinous explosion. That he is ignorant of the kind of furniture, pictures, and library; never heard of their

supposed grandeur: and he makes the declaration under oath, and, being read over, he ratifies it.

Thirdly, appeared D. J. H. de R——, advocate, native and resident of Madrid, holding office in the central university of Madrid, residing in the Plazuela ——, aged sixty-eight, and declared to be false beyond any kind of doubt that in 1809 the house of the Inquisition existed five miles from Madrid, or at Chamartin, walled, turreted, and defended by soldiers at the service of the Inquisitors. That it is farther fictitious, that three regiments of French troops went to demolish it, and having mined it, blew it up. On the contrary, there were never more than two houses used by the Inquisition of Madrid; one recently rebuilt in the Calle de Maria Cristina, No. 4. nuevo, No. 8. formerly; and another still retaining its ancient form in the Calle de Torija, No. 14. nuevo, formerly No. 1., where the Inquisitor-General resided, situated opposite the house now occupied by the English ambassador, Lord Howden. That he knew nothing of the furniture, pictures, or library there; but in reference to those in the supposed house of the Inquisition five miles from Madrid, according to Mr. Lehmanowsky's account, he could at once declare the description fictitious, because such an edifice never existed. That he could truly make this declaration, because, in 1809, he had been living at Madrid from his birth, and perfectly knew the situation of the houses of the Inquisition; never heard the report of the invented demolition, or saw any peculiar guards. Made under oath, and, being read over, ratified.

Fourthly, D. L. L ——, native of Alicante, resident and proprietor in Madrid, Calle de J ——, aged seventy-four, declared positively, that it was not true that, in the year 1809, there was any house of the Inquisition five miles distant from Madrid, nor at Chamartin, with walls, turrets, and defended by armed guards. That it is equally false that three regiments of French troops were sent to demolish it; that they mined and blew it up. But, on the contrary, it is certain there never were but two houses of the Inqui-

sition of Madrid; one, now rebuilt, in the Calle de Maria Cristina, No. 4. nuevo, No. 8. formerly; and another still retaining its ancient form in the Calle de Torija, No. 14. nuevo, formerly No. 1., where the Inquisitor-General resided, in front of that now occupied by the English ambassador, Lord Howden. That, as to the furniture, pictures, and library, he knew nothing; but as respects those mentioned in the relation derived from Mr. Lehmanowsky, existing in a house of the Inquisition five miles from Madrid, he could at once declare the description untrue, and a pure invention, for such an edifice never existed in the manner described; and that he could truly make such declaration, having been domiciled at Madrid for sixty-seven years, living there in 1809; well knowing the two houses of the Inquisition, and never till now heard of the demolition, or saw the guards who were the supposed defenders.

These are testimonies of persons of known character, present at the place, and of an age to be perfectly cognizant, at this distance of time, of all the public events of the period. They are a substantial summary of a set of papers drawn up in form, consisting of the following parts, which may be worthy of mention as a curiosity in themselves: — A request to make a statement of the subject; the recorder's warrant allowing it; the declarations of four witnesses; the recorder's declaration of the hearing and approval of witnesses' veracity; delivery of copy, three notaries verifying the signature of the judge, notary, and recorder: the judge verifies those of the notaries; the Regent of the Audiencia, the judge's; the Minister of Grace and Justice, the Regent's; the political director, the minister's; the English Consul, the minister's, in these words:

"I hereby certify, that the foregoing seal and signature are those officially employed by Don Miguel de los Santos Alvarez, Political Director in the office of her Catholic Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs . .

"Frederick Bernal, H. M.'s Consul." (Sealed.)

And, finally, the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the English Consul's:

"I certify that I believe the above signature, 'Frederick Bernal,' to be the handwriting of Frederick Bernal, Esq^re^, her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Madrid.

WODEHOUSE,
Under Secretary of State.
1855." (Seal.)

B. B. WIFFEN.

EUSTACHE DE SAINT PIERRE.

With the siege of Calais, and its surrender to Edward III. in 1347, is associated the name of Eustache de St. Pierre, whose loyalty and devotedness have been immortalised by the historian, and commemorated by the artist's pencil. The subject of Queen Philippa's intercessions on behalf of Eustache and his brave companions is, no doubt, familiar to most of your readers; the stern demeanour of the king; the tears and supplicating attitude of the Queen Philippa; and the humiliating position of the burgessess of Calais, &c. But what if Eustache de St. Pierre had been bought over by King Edward? For without going the length of pronouncing the scenes of the worthy citizens, with halters round their necks, to have been a "got up" affair, there is, however, some reason to doubt whether the boasted loyalty of Eustache de St. Pierre was such as is represented, as will appear from the following notes. And however much the statements therein contained may detract from the cherished popular notions regarding Eustache de St. Pierre, yet the seeker after truth is inexorable, or, to use the words of Sir Francis Palgrave (*Hist. of Norm. and Eng.*, i. 354.), he is expected "to uncramp or shatter the pedestals supporting the idols which have won the false worship of the multitude; so that they may nod in their niches, or topple down."

In one of the volumes forming part of that valuable collection published by the French government, and com-

menced, I believe, under the auspices of M. Guizot, namely, the *Documens inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, the following passage attracted my notice:

"Il (M. de Bréquigny) a prouvé par des titres authentiques et inconnus jusqu'à présent, qu'Eustache de St. Pierre, dont on a si fort vanté le dévouement pour les habitans de Calais, fut séduit par Edouard, et qu'il reçut de ce prince des pensions et des possessions fort peu de temps après la prise de cette place, aux conditions d'y maintenir le bon ordre, et de la conserver à l'Angleterre."—See *Lettres de Rois, &c.*, vol. i. Preface, p. cix.

The above statement is founded on a memoir read before the Académie des Belles-Lettres by M. de Bréquigny, respecting the researches made by him in London (see *Mém. de l' Acad. des Belles-Lettres*, tom. xxxvii.).

Lingard throws a doubt over the matter. He says:

"Froissart has dramatised this incident with considerable effect; but, I fear, with little attention to truth . . . Even in Froissart there is nothing to prove that Edward designed to put these men to death. On the contrary, he takes notice that the King's refusal of mercy was accompanied with a wink to his attendants, which, if it meant anythink must have meant that he was not acting seriously."—*Lingard*, 3rd edit. 1825, vol. iv. p. 79., note 85.

Again, in Hume:

"The story of the six burgesses of Calais, like all extraordinary stories, is somewhat to be suspected; and so much the more, as Avesbury, who is particular in his narrative of the surrender of Calais, says nothing of it, and, on the contrary, extols in general the King's generosity and lenity to the inhabitants."—*Hume*, 8vo. 1807, vol. ii., note II.

Both Hume and Lingard mention that Edward expelled the natives of Calais, and repeopled the place with Englishmen; but they say nothing as to Eustache de St. Pierre becoming a pensioner of the King's "aux conditions d'y maintenir le bon ordre, et de la conserver à l'Angleterre."

Châteaubriand (*Etudes Hist.*, 1831, 8vo., tome iv. p. 104.) gives Froissart's narrative, by which he abides, at the same time complaining of the "esprit de dénigrement" which he

says prevailed towards the end of the last century in regard to heroic actions.

Regarding Queen Philippa's share in the transaction above referred to, M. de Bréquigny says:

"La reine, qu'on suppose avoir été si touchée du malheur des six bourgeois dont elle venait de sauver la vie, ne laissa pas d'obtenir, peu de jours après, la confiscation des maisons que Jean d'Acre, l'un d'eux, avait possédées dans Calais."

Miss Strickland (*Lives of Queens*, 1st edit., vol. ii. p. 336.) likewise gives the story as related by Froissart, but mentions the fact of Queen Philippa taking possession of Jean d'Acre's property, and the doubt cast upon Eustache's loyalty; but she would appear to justify him by reason of King Philip's abandoning the brave Calaisiens to their fate. However this may be, documents exist proving that the inhabitants of Calais were indemnified for their losses; and whether or not the family of Eustache de St. Pierre approved his conduct, so much is certain, that, on the death of the latter, the property which had been granted to him by King Edward was confiscated, because they would not acknowledge their allegiance to the English. (vol. 7. p. 10.)

PHILIP S. KING.

OLIVER CROMWELL AS A FEOFFEE OF PARSON'S CHARITY, ELY.

There is in Ely, where Cromwell for some years resided, an extensive charity, known as Parson's Charity, of which he was a feoffee or governor. The following paper, which was submitted to Mr. Carlyle for the second or third edition of his work, contains all the references to the great Protector which are to be found in the papers now in the possession of the trustees. The appointment of Oliver Cromwell as a feoffee does not appear in any of the documents now remaining with the governors of the charity. The records of the proceedings of the feoffees of his time consist only of the collector's yearly accounts of monies received and expended, and do not show the appointments of the

feoffees. These accounts were laid before the feoffees from time to time, and signed by them in testimony of their allowance.

Cromwell's name might therefore be expected to be found at the foot of some of them; but it unfortunately happens that, from the year 1622 to the year 1641, there is an hiatus in the accounts. At the end of Book No. 1., between forty and fifty leaves have been cut away, and at the commencement of Book No. 2. about twelve leaves more. Whether some collector of curiosities has purloined these leaves for the sake of any autographs of Cromwell contained in them, or whether their removal may be accounted for by the questions which arose at the latter end of the above period as to the application of the funds of the charity, cannot now be ascertained.

There are, however, still in the possession of the governors of the charity, several documents which clearly show, that from the year 1635 to the year 1641 Cromwell was a feoffee or governor, and took an active part in the management of the affairs of the charity. There is an original bond, dated the 30th of May, 1638, from one Robert Newborne to "Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely, Oliver Cromwell, Esq., and the rest of the Corporation of Ely." The feoffees had then been incorporated by royal charter, under the title of "The Governors of the Lands and Possessions of the Poor of the City or Town of Ely."

There are some detached collectors' accounts extending over a portion of the interval between 1622 and 1641, and indorsed, "The Accoumpts of Mr. John Hand and Mr. William Cranford, Collectors of the Revenewes belonging to the Towne of Ely."

The following entries are extracted from these accounts:—

"The Disbursements of Mr. John Hand from the of August 1636 unto the of 1641."

"Anno 1636."

After several other items,—

	£	s.	d.
"Given to diverse Poore People at ye Worke-house, in the presence of Mr. Archdeacon of Ely, Mr. Oliver Cromwell, Mr. John Goodericke and others, Febr. 10th 1636, as appeareth,	16	14	0
Summa Expens. Ann. 1636 - - -	36	3	6"

"The Disbursements of Mr. Cranford."

"Item, to Jones, by Mr. Cromwell's consent - -	1	0	0"

Mr. Cranford's disbursements show no dates. His receipts immediately followed Mr. Hand's in point of dates.

About the year 1639 a petition was filed in the Court of Chancery by one Thomas Fowler, on behalf of himself and others, inhabitants of Ely, against the feoffees of Parson's Charity, and a commission for charitable uses was issued. The commissioners sat at Ely on the 25th of January, 1641, and at Cambridge on the 3rd of March in the same year, when several of the feoffees, with other persons, were examined.

At the conclusion of the joint deposition of John Hand and William Cranford, two of the feoffees, is the following statement:—

"And as to the Profitts of the said Lands in theire tyme receaved, they never disposed of any parte thereof but by the direction and appointmt of Mr. Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely, Mr. William March, and Mr. Oliver Cromwell."

"These last two names were inserted att Camb. 3 Mar. 1641, by Mr. Hy. C."

The last name in the above note is illegible, and the last two names in the deposition are of a different ink and handwriting from the preceding part, but of the same ink and writing as the note.

An original summons to the feoffees, signed by the commissioners, is preserved. It requires them to appear before the commissioners at the Dolphin Inn, in Ely, on the 25th of the then instant January, to produce before the commissioners a true account "of the monies, fines, rents, and profits by you and every of you and your predecessors feoffes receaved out of the land given by one Parsons for the be-

nefitt of the inhabitants of Ely for 16 years past," &c. The summons is dated at Cambridge, the 13th of January, 1641, and is signed by the three commissioners,

"Tho. Symon.
Tho. Duckett.
Dudley Page."

The summons is addressed

"To Matthew, Lord Bishop of Ely,
Willm. Fuller, Deane of Ely, and to
Daniell Wigmore, Archdeacon of Ely.
William March, Esq.
Anthony Page, Esq.
Henry Goodericke, Gent.
Oliver Cromwell, Esq.
Willm. Anger.
Willm. Cranford.
John Hand, and
Willm. Austen."

Whether Cromwell attended the sitting of the commissioners does not appear.

The letter from Cromwell to Mr. John Hand, published in Cromwell's *Memoirs of Cromwell*, has not been in the possession of the feoffees for some years.

There is, however, an item in Mr. Hand's disbursements, which probably refers to the person mentioned in that letter. It is as follows:—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
"Ffor phisicke and surgery for old Benson -	- 2	7	4"

Cromwell's letter appears to be at a later date than this item.

John Hand was a feoffee for many years, and during his time executed, as was usual, the office of collector or treasurer. It may be gathered from the documents preserved, that Cromwell never executed that office. The office was usually taken by the feoffees in turn then, as at the present time; but Cromwell most probably was called to a higher sphere of action before his turn arrived.

It is worthy of note, that Cromwell's fellow-trustees, the Bishop of Ely (who was the celebrated Matthew Wren), Fuller the Dean, and Wigmore the Archdeacon, were all severely handled during the Rebellion.

ARUN.—(vol. i. p. 466.)

LADY CATHERINE GREY.

Her marriage with William Earl of Hertford is stated to have taken place in the latter end of the year 1560, "between Allhallowtide and Christmas," in the earl's house in Cannon Row; and the clergyman is said to have been a Puritan divine, "one of those lately returned from Germany. Is his name known, and the exact day of the month when the marriage took place?

In reply to this query, Broctuna, vol. vii. p. 68., writes as follows:—

There appears to be some doubt if the alleged marriage ever did take place, for I find, in Baker's *Chronicles*, p. 334., that in 1563 "divers great persons were questioned and condemned, but had their lives spared," and among them —

"Lady Katherine Grey, daughter to Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk, by the eldest daughter of Charles Brandon, having formerly been married to the Earl of Pembroke's eldest son, and from him soon after lawfully divorced, was some years after found to be with child by Edward Seymour Earl of Hartford, who, being at that time in France, was presently sent for: and being examined before the Archbishop of Canterbury, and affirming they were lawfully married, but not being able within a limited time to produce witnesses of their marriage, they were both committed to the Tower."

After some further particulars of the birth of a second child in the Tower, the discharge of the Lieutenant, Sir Edward Warner, and the fining of the Earl by the Star Chamber to the extent of 5000*l.*, the narrative proceeds:—

"Though in pleading of his case, one John Hales argued they were lawful man and wife *by virtue of their own bare consent, without any ecclesiastical ceremony.*"

Collins, in his *Peerage* (1735), states:—

"The validity of this marriage being afterwards tried at Common Law, the minister who married them being present, and other circumstances agreeing, the jury (whereof John Digby, Esq., was foreman) found it a good marriage."

Sharpe, in his *Peerage* (1833), under the title "Stamford," says:—

"'The manner of her departing' *in the Tower*, which Mr. Ellis has printed from a MS. so entitled in the Harleian Collection, although less terrible, is scarcely less affecting than that of her heroic sister," &c.

CROMWELL POISONED.

At p. 516. vol. ii. of Burton's *Parliamentary Diary* it is stated, in a note upon the death of Oliver Cromwell, that his body exhibited certain appearances "owing to the disease of which the Protector died, which, by the by, appeared to be that of poison." The words, "Prestwich's MS." are attached to this note.

In the *Athenæ Oxoniensis* of Anthony à Wood, vol. ii. p. 303., it is stated that Dr. George Bate's friends gave him credit for having given a baneful dose to the Protector, to ingratiate himself with Charles II. Amidst all the mutations of those changeful times, and whether Charles I., Cromwell, or Charles II. were in the ascendant, Dr. George Bate always contrived to be the chief state physician. In Whitelock's *Memorials of the English Affairs* (1732), p. 494., it appears that the Parliament, in 1651, ordered Dr. Bate to go into Scotland to attend the General (Cromwell), and to take care of his health; he being his usual physician in London, and well esteemed by him. He wrote a work styled *Elenchus Motuum nuperorum in Angliâ*. This was severely scrutinised in another, entitled *Elenchus Elenchi; sive Animadversiones in Georgii Bati, Cromwelli Paricidæ, aliquando Protomedici, Elenchi Motuum nuperorum in Angliâ. Autore Robt. Pugh: Parisiis*, 1664.

Dr. Bate who died 19th April 1669, was buried at Kingston-upon-Thames. (vol. ii. p. 367.)

OLIVER CROMWELL AND HIS DEALINGS WITH THE DEVIL.

Echard says that his highness sold himself to the devil, and *that he had seen the solemn compact.* Anthony â Wood, who doubtless credited this account of a furious brother loyalist, in his Journal says:—

"Aug. 30. 1658. Monday, a terrible raging wind happened, which did much damage. Dennis Bond, a great Oliverian and anti-monarchist, died on that day, and then the devil took *bond* for Oliver's appearance."

Clarendon, assigning the Protector to eternal perdition, not liking to lose the portent, boldly says the remarkable hurricane occurred on September 3, the day of Oliver's death. Oliver's admirers, on the other hand, represent this wind as ushering him into the other world, but for a very different reason.

Heath, in his *Flagellum* (I have the 4th edit.) says:—

"It pleased God to usher in his end with a great whale *some three months before*, June 2, that came up as far as Greenwich, and there was killed; and more immediately by a terrible storm of wind: the prognosticks that the great Leviathan of men, that tempest and overthrow of government, was now going to his own place!"

I have several works concerning Cromwell, but in no other do I find this story very like a whale. Would some reader of better opportunities favour us with a record of these two matters of natural history, not as connected with the death of this remarkable man, but as mere events? Your well-read readers will remember some similar tales relative to the death of Cardinal Mazarine. These exuberances of vulgar minds may partly be attributed to the credulity of the age, but more probably to the same want of philosophy which caused the ancients to deal in exaggeration. (vol. iii. p. 207.) B. B.

This note led to the following from S. H. H.:

Among the papers of an old personal friend and correspondent of the "Sylvanus Urban" of his day, — a clergyman of the good old school, who died a quarter of a

century ago, aged eighty-six, I find the inclosed. It is unfortunate that no date is attached to it, nor any intimation of its history. Its owner was the intimate friend of Bennet, Bishop of Cloyne, of Dr. Farmer, of Burgess, Bishop of St. David's (afterwards Salisbury), and other eminent divines of his time.

With this MS. was inclosed another, in more modern writing; but, from the orthography, copied from an older paper, headed "Private Amours of Oliver Cromwell."

A NARRATIVE CONCERNING CROMWELL'S DEALINGS WITH THE D——L.

"On ye 3d of Sept., in ye morning, Cromwell took Colonel Lindsey, his intimate friend, and first Capt. of his regiment, to a wood side not far from ye army, and bid him alight and follow him into that wood, & take particular notice of what he saw & heard.

"After they had both alighted & secured their horses, & walked some small way into the wood, Lindsey began to turn pale, & to be seized with horrour, from some unknown cause: upon wch Cromwell askt him how he did, or how he felt himself. He answered, that he was in such a trembling & consternation that he never felt ye like in all ye conflicts and battles he had been engaged in: But wether it proceeded from ye gloomyness of ye place, or ye temperament of his body, he knew not. 'How now?' said Cromwell, 'what! trowbled with vapours? Come forward, man.' They had not gon above 20 yards before Lindsey on a sudden stood still and cry'd out, by all that's good he was seized with such unaccountable terrours & astonishment that it was impossible for him to stir one step further. Upon which Cromwell call'd him faint-hearted fool, & bid him stand there & observe or be witness: and then advancing to some distance from him, he met with a grave elderly man, with a roll of parchment in his hand, who deliver'd it to Cromwell, who eagerly perused it. Lindsey, a little recover'd from his fear, heard severall loud words betwixt them: particularly Cromwell said, 'This is but for seven year. I was to have it for 21, and it must and shall be so.' The other told him positively it coud not be for above seven; upon which Cromwell cry'd with a great fierceness, it shd be, however, for 14 year; but the other person plorily declared it could not possibly be for any longer time: and if he woud not take it so, there was others that woud accept of it: Upon which Cromwell at last took ye parchment, and returning to Lindsey with great joy in his countenance, he cry'd, 'Now, Lindsey, the battle's our own: I long to be engag'd.'

Returning out of the wood, they rode to y^e^ army, Cromwell with a resolution to engage as soon as possible, & y^e^ other with a design of leaving y^e^ army as soon. After y^e^ first charge Lindsey deserted his post, and rode away with all possible speed, day and night, till he came into y^e^ county of Norfolk, to y^e^ house of an intimate friend, and minister of that parish: Cromwell, so soon as he mist him, sent all ways after him, with a promise of a great reward to any that w'd bring him alive or dead.

"Thus far y^e^ narrative of Lindsey himself; but something further is to be remembered to complete & confirm y^e^ story.

"When Mr. Thorowgood saw his friend Lindsey come into his yard, his horse and himself just tired, in a sort of amaze he said, 'How, now, Colonel; we hear there is like to be a battle shortly. What! fled from your colours?' 'A battle!' said y^e^ other; 'yes, there has bin a battle, and I am sure y^e^ King is beaten. If ever I strike a stroke for Cromwell again, may I perish eternally, for I am sure he has made a league with y^e^ Devil, and he will have him in due time.' Then, desiring his protection from Cromwell's inquisitors, he went in & related y^e^ whole story, and all the circumstances, concluding with these remarkable words, That Cromwell w'd certainly die that day seven year that the battle was fought.

"The strangeness of his relation caused Mr. Thorowgood to order his son John, then about 12 years of age, to write it in full length in his common place book, & to take it from Lindsey's own mouth. This common place book, and likewise y^e^ same story writen in other books, I am sure is still preserv'd in y^e^ family of y^e^ Thorowgoods: But how far Lindsey is to be believed, & how far y^e^ story is to be accounted incredible, is left to y^e^ reader's faith and judgment, and not to any determination of our own."

PRIVATE AMOURS OF OLIVER CROMWELL.

The subjoined appears to be a carelessly-made transcript of a contemporary MS., the production, probably, of some warm royalist, who may, or may not, have had some grounds for his assertions. At all events, it gives a few curious details, and, in its general outline, agrees singularly with the incidents on which Mrs. Behn's play, *The Round Heads; or The Good Old Cause*, is founded: sufficiently so to give it at least an air of authenticity, so far as the popular belief of the day was concerned.

"After Cromwell had been declared General of the Commonwealth's

Forces, he seized the possessions of the Royalists, who had escaped his implacable resentment; and the New Hall fell to the share of the Usurper, who, flushed with the victory of Worcester, disposed at pleasure of the forsaken seats of the noble Fugitives, who still supported Charles II.'s Drooping Standards; and adding insulte to oppression, commanded the domesticks of the Duke of Buckingham to follow their master's desperate fortune, and to carry him five shillings, which he might want in his exile, for the purchase of a Lordship, whose yearly value exceeded then 1300*l.* Cromwell kept possession of New Hall till he assumed the title of Protector, and was instaled at White Hall, in the Pallace of the English Kings: Then he chose Hampton Court for his Summer Residence. He led at New Hall an obscure life, without pomp, without luxury, having but two servants in his retinue. Though his manners were naturally austere, he had some private amoures, which he indulged with great Caution and Secrecy. His favourites were General Lambert's wife and Major-General Vernon's sister: the first was a well-bred, genteel woman, fatheless to her husband from natural aversion, and attached to Cromwell from a conformity of inclination in a mysterious enjoyment and stolen embraces, with mask of religious deportment and severe virtue: the other was a person made to inspire lust and desire, but selfish, revengefull, and indiscreet. These two rivals heartily detested each other: Mrs. Lambert reproached Cromwell for his affection to a worthless, giddy, and wanton woman; and Mrs. Vernon laughed at him for being the dupe of the affected fondness and hipocry of an artful Mistress. They once met at the house of Colonel Hammond, a Creature of Cromwell's, and reviled each other with the most virulent sarcasms. Mrs. Lambert, fired with rage and resentment, went immediately to New Hall, where Oliver was at that juncture, and insisted upon her Rival's dismission for her unprovoked outrage. Cromwell, who was then past the meridian of voluptuous sensations, sacrificed the person he was no longer fit to enjoy, to a woman who had gained his esteem and confidence, and delegated to Mrs. Lambert all the domestic concerns of his house in Essex. Cromwell's wife, called afterwards the Protectress, was a sober helpmate, who, dressed in humble stuff, like a Quaker, neither interfered in his amours or politics. She never went to New Hall but once, and that was on the 25th of April, 1652, when he invited all his family to a grand entertainment on account of his Birthday. The other Guests were, his mother, who survived his elevation to the Protectorship: she was a virtuous woman of the name of Stewart, related to the Royall Family; Desborough, his brother-in-law; and Fleetwood, who had married his daughter; his Eldest Son, Richard, a man of an inoffensive and unambitious Character, who had been

married some years, and lived in the country on a small estate which he possessed in right of his wife, where he spent his time in acts of benevolence: at the trial of Charles I. he fell on his knees and conjured his Father in the most pathetic manner to spare the life of his Sovereign; his brother Henry, afterwards Governor of Ireland, where he was universally beloved for his mild administration; Mrs. Claypole, the darling of her father; and his three other daughters: Mrs. Rich, married to the Grandson and heir of the Earl of Warwick; Lady Falconbridge; and the Youngest, who lived in celibacy. They spent a week at New Hall, in innocent mirth and jollity; Oliver himself joining in convivial pleasure with his children, disengaged the whole time from state affairs and Political Speculations.

"His constant visitors at New Hall were some Regicides, and the meanest, lowest, and most ignorant among the Citizens on whome he had decreed that the Sovereign power should be vested. To excell in Fanaticism seemed a necessary qualification in this new parliament; and Oliver foresaw that they would soon throw up the reins of Government, which they were unqualified to guide, and raise himself to an unlimited power far beyond that of former Kings.

"It seems Mrs. Lambert continued to reside at New Hall during Cromwell's Protectorship, and that Col. Wite, his trusty friend, was often sent with kind messages and preasents from Oliver, who travelled himself in the night, with hurry and precipitation, to enjoy with her some moments of domestic comfort and tranquility."

WHERE WAS CROMWELL BURIED?

It has been the belief of many that the burial at Westminster Abbey was a mock ceremony; that in case a change in the ruling powers should take place, his remains were deposited in a place of greater security, and that the spot selected for his grave was the field of Naseby. The author of *The Compleat History of England* speaks of a "Mr. Barkstead, the regicide's son," as being ready to depose —

"That the said Barkstead his father, being Lieutenant of the Tower, and a great confident of Cromwell's, did, among other such confidents, in the time of his illness, desire to know where he would be buried; to which the Protector answered, 'where he had obtained the greatest victory and glory, and as nigh the spot as could be guessed

where the heat of the action was, viz. in the field at Naseby in com. Northampton.' That at midnight, soon after his death, the body (being first embalmed and wrapt in a leaden coffin) was in a hearse conveyed to the said field, Mr. Barkstead himself attending, by order of his father, close to the hearse. That being come to the field, they found about the midst of it a grave dug about nine feet deep, with the green-sod carefully laid on one side and the mould on the other, in which the coffin being put, the grave was instantly filled up, and the green-sod laid exactly flat upon it, care being taken that the surplus mould should be clean removed. That soon after the like care was taken that the ground should be ploughed up, and that it was sowed successively with corn."

The author further states that the deponent was about fifteen years old at the time of Cromwell's death.

Some seven or eight years ago I visited the field of Naseby; and whilst there, I met by accident with the aged clergyman of Naseby. Our conversation naturally referred to the historical incident that had given so much interest to the spot; and finally we spoke of this very subject. I remember his telling me that he had collected some very important memoranda relative to this matter. I think he said, "which proved the arrival of his remains at *Huntingdon*, on their road *elsewhere*."

Has this subject been properly investigated? and has any research been made which has led to a satisfactory decision of the question? A. B.—(vol. v. p. 396.)

In reply to this query, Mr. Oliver Pemberton writes as follows:—

A. B. will find that the interesting inquiry relative to the last resting-place of Cromwell, has been investigated in a little work by Henry Lockinge, M.A., late curate of Naseby, entitled *Historical Gleanings on the Memorable Field of Naseby*, published in 1830. Mr. Lockinge, besides alluding to the "Memoranda" of the vicar, the Rev. W. Marshall, on the subject, adduces evidence, apparently satisfactory, which leaves the Protector's remains slumbering, "uncommemorated, beneath the turf of Naseby Field."

DEFENDER OF THE FAITH.

In Banks' *Dormant and Extinct Baronetage*, pp. 408-9, vol. iv., I find the following:—

"He (Henry VIII.) was the first English monarch who obtained the title of Defender of the Faith, which was conferred upon him by Pope Leo X., for a book written by him against Martin Luther."

To which the following note is subjoined:—

"But in a letter from Christopher Wren, Esq., to Francis Peek, M.A. (author of the *Desiderata Curiosa*), it is thus stated; viz., 'that King Henry VII. had the title of Defender of the Faith, appears by the Register of the Order of the Garter in the black book, (sic dictum a tegmine,) now in my hands, by office, which having been shown to King Charles I., he received with much joy; nothing more pleasing him than that the right of that title was fixed in the crown long before the Pope's pretended donation, to all which I make protestation to all posterity.' Αὐτογράφω, hoc meo. Ità testor. Chr. Wren, à memoria, et secretis Honoratissimi Ordinis. Wrexham, 4 March, 1736-7."

In support of this note, I find in Chamberlayne's *Present State of England*, 1669, p. 88., this statement:—

"Defender of the Faith was anciently used by the Kings of England, as appears by several charters granted to the University of Oxford," &c.

As the word *anciently*, I conceive, applies to a period anterior to 1521, may I express a hope that some of your learned subscribers at Oxford will favour your readers with the dates of the charters alluded to; and, if possible, some information as to the circumstances which led to the adoption of the title "Defender of the Faith" by the kings of England previous to the reign of Henry VIII.

ROBERT ANSTRUTHER, Lieut.-Col.—(vol. ii. p. 442.)

In reply to this, Mr. Sidney Gibson writes as follows:—

It is quite startling to be told that the title of "Defender of the Faith" was used by any royal predecessor of Henry VIII.

Selden (*Titles of Honour*, ed. 1631, p. 54.), says:—

"The beginning and ground of that attribute of DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, which hath been perpetually, in the latter ages, added to the style of the kings of England, (not only in the first person, but frequent also in the second and in the third, as common use shows in the formality of instruments of conveyance, leases and such like,) is most certainly known. It began in Henry the VIII. For he, in those awaking times, upon the quarrel of the Romanists and Lutherans, wrote a volume against Luther," &c.

Selden then states the well-known occasion upon which this title was conferred, and sets out the Bull of Leo X. (then extant in the Collection of Sir Robert Cotton, and now in the British Museum), whereby the Pope, "holding it just to distinguish those who have undertaken such pious labours for defending the faith of Christ with every honour and commendation," decrees that to the title of King the subjects of the royal controversialist shall add the title "Fidei Defensori." The pontiff adds, that a more worthy title could not be found.

Your correspondent, COLONEL ANSTRUTHER, calls attention to the statement made by Mr. Christopher Wren, Secretary of the Order of the Garter (A. D. 1736), in his letter to Francis Peek, on the authority of the Register of the Order in his possession; which letter is quoted by Burke (*Dorm. and Ext. Bar.*, iv. 408.), that "King Henry VII. had the title of Defender of the Faith." It is not found in any acts or instruments of his reign that I am acquainted with, nor in the proclamation on his interment, nor in any of the epitaphs engraved on his magnificent tomb. (Sandford, *Geneal. Hist.*) Nor is it probable that Pope Leo X., in those days of diplomatic intercourse with England, would have bestowed on Henry VIII., as a special and personal distinction and reward, a title that had been used by his royal predecessors.

I am not aware that any such title is attributed to the sovereign in any of the English records anterior to 1521; but that many English kings gloried in professing their zeal to defend the Church and religion, appears from many ex-

amples. Henry IV., in the second year of his reign, promises to maintain and defend the Christian religion (*Rot. Parl.*, iii. 466.); and on his renewed promise, in the fourth year of his reign, to defend the Christian faith, the Commons piously grant a subsidy (*Ibid.*, 493.); and Henry VI., in the twentieth year of his reign, acts as keeper of the Christian faith. (*Rot. Parl.*, v. 61.)

In the admonition used in the investiture of a knight with the insignia of the Garter, he is told to take the crimson robe, and being therewith defended, to be bold to fight and shed his blood for Christ's faith, the liberties of the Church, and the defence of the oppressed. In this sense, the sovereign and every knight became a sworn defender of the faith. Can this duty have come to be popularly attributed as part of the royal style and title?

The Bull of Leo X., which confers the title on Henry VIII. personally, does not make it inheritable by his successors, so that none but that king himself could claim the honour. The Bull granted two years afterwards by Clement VII. merely confirms the grant of Pope Leo to the king himself. It was given, as we know, for his assertion of doctrines of the Church of Rome; yet he retained it after his separation from the Roman Catholic communion, and after it had been formally revoked and withdrawn by Pope Paul III. in the twenty-seventh year of Henry VIII., upon the king's apostacy in turning suppressor of religious houses. In 1543, the Reformation legislature and the Anti-papal king, without condescending to notice any Papal Bulls, assumed to treat the title that the Pope had given and taken away as a subject of Parliamentary gift, and annexed it for ever to the English crown by the statute 35 Hen. VIII. c. 3., from which I make the following extract, as its language bears upon the question:

"Where our most dread, &c., lord the king, hath heretofore been, and is justly, lawfully, and notoriously knowen, named, published, and declared to be King of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and of the Church of England and also of Ireland, in earth supreme head; and hath justly and lawfully used the title and

name thereof as to his Grace appertaineth. Be it enacted, &c., that all and singular his Grace's subjects, &c., shall from henceforth accept and take the same his Majesty's style . . . . viz., in the English tongue by these words, Henry the Eighth, by the grace of God King of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and of the Church of England, and also of Ireland, in earth the supreme head; and that the said style, &c., shall be, &c., united and annexed for ever to the imperial crown of his highness's realms of England."

By the supposed authority of this statute, and notwithstanding the revocation of the title by Pope Paul III., and its omission in the Bull addressed by Pope Julius III. to Philip and Mary, that princess, before and after her marriage, used this style, and the statute having been re-established by 1 Eliz. c. 1., the example has been followed by her royal Protestant successors, who wished thereby to declare themselves Defenders of the Anti-papal Church. The learned Bishop Gibson, in his *Codex* (i. 33., note), treats this title as having commenced in Henry VIII. So do Blount, Cowel, and such like authorities. Since writing the above, I have found (in the nineteenth volume of *Archæologia*, pp. 1—10.) an essay by Mr. Alex. Luders on this very subject, in which that able writer, who was well accustomed to examine historical records, refers to many examples in which the title "Most Christian King" was attributed to, or used by, English sovereigns, as well as the kings of France; and to the fact, that this style was used by Henry VII., as appears from his contract with the Abbot of Westminster (Harl. MS. 1498.). Selden tells us that the emperors had from early times been styled "Defensores Ecclesiæ;" and from the instances cited by Mr. Luders, it appears that the title of "Most Christian" was appropriated to kings of France from a very ancient period; that Pepin received it (A. D. 755) from the Pope, and Charles the Bald (A. D. 859) from a Council: and Charles VI. refers to ancient usage for this title, and makes use of these words:

"—— nostrorum progenitorum imitatione — evangelicæ veritatis DEFENSORES — nostra regia dignitas divino Christianæ religionis titulo gloriosius insignitur ——,"

Mr. Luders refers to the use of the words "Nos zelo *fidei catholicæ*, cujus sumus et erimus Deo dante *Defensores*, salubriter commoti" in the charter of Richard II. to the Chancellor of Oxford, in the nineteenth year of his reign, as the earliest introduction of such phrases into acts of the kings of England that he had met with. This zeal was for the condemnation of Wycliff's *Trialogus*. In the reign of Hen. IV. the writ "De Hæretico comburendo" had the words "Zelator justitia et fidei catholicæ cultor;" and the title of "Très Chrêtien" occurs in several instruments of Hen. VI. and Edw. IV. It appears very probable that this usage was the foundation of the statement made by Chamberlayne and by Mr. Christopher Wren: but that the title of Defender of the Faith was used as part of the royal style before 1521, is, I believe, quite untrue. Vol. ii. p. 481.

To this Colonel Anstruther rejoined:—

I regret that my Note, inserted in your paper of Nov. 30th, was so ambiguously written as to elicit such a reply as it has been favoured with by Mr. Gibson.

What I meant to say in my last Note was simply this—that two persons, viz. Messrs. Christopher Wren and Chamberlayne, have asserted that the title "Defender of the Faith" had been used by our monarchs anterior to 1521; and, in support of their assertions, cite the Black Book of the order of the garter, and several charters granted to the University of Oxford: that is, each gives a distinct proof of his allegation.

Had Mr. Gibson understood my Note, as I trust he now will, he will see at once that the expression "untrue" is totally inapplicable to their statements, at least upon any showing upon his part; for he does not appear to me to have consulted either the Black Book or the charters, on which alone their assertions are based, to which alone we must in common honesty refer, and by which alone their veracity must be judged.

That their "startling" statements do not appear in Selden, nor in Luder's brief paper in the 19th vol. of the

Archæologia, is conceded; but I think it might have occurred to the mind of one of less acumen than Mr. Gibson, that it was precisely because the allegations do not appear in these or any other writers or authorities, that I considered them not unworthy of the attention of the readers of the "NOTES AND QUERIES." I am at a loss to reconcile Mr. Gibson's expression "startling," as applied to the assertions of Messrs. Wren and Chamberlayne (and I need not add, that had they not been startling to myself as to him, they would never have found their way to your paper), with the following paragraph:—

"In this sense, the sovereign and every knight became a sworn defender of the faith. Can this duty have come to be popularly attributed as part of the royal style and title?"

I do not allude to this statement in a critical point of view, but simply, as, from the general tenor of his communication, Mr. Gibson appears to labour under an impression, that, from ignorance of historical authorities, I have merely given utterance to a *popular* fallacy, unheard of by him and other learned men; and, like the "curfew," to be found in no contemporaneous writer. I beg, however, to assure him, that before forwarding the note and question to your paper, I had examined not only the Bulls, and our best historians, but also the works of such writers as Prynne, Lord Herbert, Spelman, Camden, and others, who have in any way treated of regal titles and prerogatives.

Vol. iii. p. 10.

In *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, vol. vi. p. 321., is an indenture of lease

"maide the xxijth day of Januarye, in the second yeare of the reagne of King Henry the seaventhe, by the graice of God Kinge of England, *defendoure of the faithe*," &c.

The lessor, Christopher Ratlife, of Hewick, died before 10 Henry VII.; and the editor of the above work says, "It is impossible to account for the peculiarity in the date of this deed."

Bishop Burnet cites Spelman as asserting that several of

the kings of England before Henry VIII. had borne the title of "Defender of the Faith." A correspondent of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (N.S. xvi. 357.) conjectures that the name of Spelman had been inadvertently substituted for the name of Selden; though he justly remarks, that Selden by no means countenances the assertion of the bishop. C. H. Cooper.—(vol. iii. p. 28.)

In the fourth part of Prynne's *Institutes*, pp. 229–30, and 295–6–7, will be found, set out at full length, divers letters close and patent from King Richard II. in the 6th, 11th, and 19th years of his reign, for suppressing the heresies of Wickliff and his followers. These letters are addressed to the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, William Archbishop of Canterbury (Courtney), and to Ralfe Crombewell, Chivalier, and John Lekyll, and the Mayor and Bailiffs of Nottingham, in which King Richard II. styles himself thus—"Nos Zelo Fidei Catholicæ, Cujus Sumus Et Esse Volumus Defensores," &c.

H. Witham.—(vol. iii. p. 94.)

Should not King Edward the Confessor's claim to *defend the church as God's Vicar* be added to the several valuable notices in relation to the title *Defender of the Faith*, with which some of your learned contributors have favoured us through your pages?

According to Hoveden, one of the laws adopted from the Anglo-Saxons by *William* was:—

"Rex autem atque vicarius Ejus ad hoc est constitutus, ut regnum terrenum, populum Dei, et super omnia *sanctam ecclesiam*, revereatur et ab injuriatoribus *defendat*," &c.

Which duty of princes was further enforced by the words—

"Illos decet vocari reges, qui vigilant, *defendunt*, et regunt Ecclesiam Dei et populum Ejus, imitantes regem psalmographum," &c.—Vid. *Rogeri de Hoveden Annal.*, par. post., §. Regis Officium; ap. Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores post Bedam, ed. Francof. 1601, p. 604. Conf. Prynne's *Chronol. Records*, ed. Lond. 1666, tom. i. p. 310.

This law appears always to have been received as of authority after the Conquest; and it may, perhaps, be con-

sidered as the first seed of that constitutional church supremacy vested in our sovereigns, which several of our kings before the Reformation had occasion to vindicate against Papal claims, and which Henry VIII. strove to carry in the other direction to an unconstitutional excess.

J. Sansom.—(iii. p. 157.)

EXECUTION OF CHARLES I.

The following communications appeared in reply to a query as to the name of the executioner who beheaded Charles I.

Minutes of the trial and *conviction* of one "William Hulett, alias Howlett," on the charge of having struck "the fatal blow," will be found in *An exact and most impartial Accompt of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to Law) of Twenty-nine Regicides, &c.* 1660. How far the verdict was consistent with the evidence (or, indeed, the whole proceedings of that court with the modern sense of justice), abler judges than I have long since determined.

On behalf of the prisoner Hulett, witnesses ("not to be admitted upon oath against the king") deposed that the common hangman, Richard Brandon, had frequently confessed (though he had also denied) that *he* had beheaded the king. One of these depositions, that of William Cox, is so remarkable, that I am induced to transcribe it. If it be true, we need hardly question that Richard Brandon was the executioner.

"*William Cox* examined.

"When my Lord Capell, Duke Hamilton, and the Earl of Holland, were beheaded in the Palace-yard, in Westminster, my Lord Capell asked the common hangman, said he, 'Did you cut off my master's head?' 'Yes,' saith he. 'Where is the instrument that did it?' He then brought the ax. 'Is this the same ax; are you sure?' said my Lord. 'Yes, my Lord,' saith the hangman, 'I am very sure it is the same.' My Lord Capell took the ax and kissed it, and gave him five pieces of gold. I heard him say, 'Sirrah, wert thou not

affraid?' Saith the hangman, 'They made me cut it off, and I had thirty pound for my pains.'"

William Franks Mathews.—(ii. p. 110.)

Mr. Hunter gives a tradition, in his *History of Hallamshire*, that a certain William Walker, who died in 1700, and to whose memory there was an inscribed brass plate in the parish church of Sheffield, was the executioner of Charles I. The man obtained this reputation from having retired from political life at the Restoration, to his native village, Darnall, near Sheffield, where he is said to have made death-bed disclosures, avowing that he beheaded the king. The tradition has been supported, perhaps suggested, by the name of Walker having occurred during the trials of some of the regicides, as that of the real executioner.

Alfred Gatty.—(ii. p. 140.)

In Lilly's *History of his Life and Times*, I find the following interesting account in regard to the vizored executioner of Charles I., being part of the evidence he gave when examined before the first parliament of King Charles II. respecting the matter. Lilly writes, —

"Liberty being given me to speak, I related what follows: viz., That the next Sunday but one after Charles I. was beheaded, Robert Spavin, Secretary to Lieutenant-General Cromwell at that time, invited himself to dinner with me, and brought Anthony Pearson and several others along with him to dinner. That their principal discourse all dinner time was only who it was that beheaded the king. One said it was the common hangman; another, Hugh Peters; others were also nominated, but none concluded. Robert Spavin, so soon as dinner was done, took me by the hand, and carried me to the south window. Saith he, 'These are all mistaken; they have not named the man that did the fact: it was Lieutenant-Colonel Joice. I was in the room when he fitted himself for the work; stood behind him when he did it; when done, went in with him again: there is no man knows this but my master, viz. Cromwell, Commissary Ireton, and myself.' — 'Doth Mr. Rushworth know it?' saith I. 'No, he doth not know it,' saith Spavin. The same thing Spavin since has often related to me, when we were alone."

R. W. E.—(ii. p. 268.)

In a letter which is preserved in the State Paper office,

addressed to Secretary Bennet, by Lord Ormonde and the Council of Ireland, and dated the 29th of April, 1663, their Lordships request the Secretary to move his Majesty that "Henry Porter, then known as Martial General Porter, standing charged as being the person by whose hand the head of our late Sovereign King Charles the First, of blessed memory, was cutt off, and now two years imprisoned in Dublin, should be brought to trial in England." J. F. F. — (v. p. 28.)

LAST DAYS OF GEORGE IV.

On May 24, 1830, a message was delivered to both Houses of Parliament to the effect that the King found it "inconvenient" to sign public documents with his own hand. A bill immediately passed both Houses, authorising the sign-manual to be executed by a stamp, which was to be used for that purpose in the king's presence, every document being first indorsed by three members of the Privy Council. On the 26th of June following his Majesty expired, at three o'clock in the morning.

In the *London Gazette* of June 4, 1830, will be found the following notice: "The king has been pleased to appoint the Right Hon. Charles Lord Farnborough, Gen. Sir Wm. Keppel, and Major-Gen. Sir Andrew Francis Barnard, to be his Commissioners for affixing his Majesty's signature to instruments requiring the same." This was in consequence of the Act 11 Geo. IV. cap. 23., passed May 29th, 1830. The principal public Acts passed from that day to the death of the king are the following: 11 Geo. IV. cap. 16., Duties on leather; cap. 17., Malt duties; cap. 18., Marriages; cap. 20., Pay of the navy; cap. 26., Exchequer bills; cap. 27., General lighting and watching; cap. 29., Militia ballot; cap. 30., Population.

CONVOCATION IN THE REIGN OF GEORGE II.

One hears it so often repeated, that Convocation was finally suppressed in 1717, in consequence of the accusa-

tions brought by the Lower House against Bishop Hoadley, that it seems worth while noting, in correction of this, that, though no licence from the Crown to make canons has ever been granted since that time, yet that Convocation met and sat in 1728, and again for some sessions in the spring of 1742, when several important subjects were brought before it; among which was the very interesting question of curates' stipends, in these words,—

"VIIth. That much reproach is brought upon the beneficed, and much oppression upon the unbeneficed, clergy, by curates accepting too scanty salaries from incumbents,"

and which was really the last subject that was ever brought before Convocation. On Jan. 27, 1742, it was unanimously agreed, that "the motion made by the Archdeacon of Lincoln concerning ecclesiastical courts and clandestine marriages, the qualifications of persons to be admitted into holy orders, and the salaries and titles of curates," should be "reduced into writing, and the particulars offered to the House at their next assembly." But in the next session, on March 5, 1742, the Prolocutor, Dr. Lisle, was afraid to go on with the business before the House, and after "speaking much of a *præmunire*," and "echoing and reverberating the word from one side of good King Henry's Chapel to the other," the whole was let drop; and Convocation was fully consigned to the silence and the slumber of a century. The whole of these transactions are detailed in a scarce pamphlet, *A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Lisle, Prolocutor of the Lower House*, by the Archdeacon of Lincoln (the Venerable G. Reynolds) W. Fraser. — (viii. p. 465.)

CROMWELL'S BIRTH AND BAPTISM.

The following is a copy from the *Register* of All Saints' Church, Huntingdon, of the birth and baptism of Oliver Cromwell: —

"Anno Domini 1599 Oliverus filius Roberti Cromwell generosi et Elisabethæ huxoris ejus Natus vicesimo quinto die Aprilis et Baptisatus vicesimo nono ejusdem mensis."

Then follow the words "England's plague for many years," written in a different hand.

As a *pendant* to this certificate of Cromwell's baptism, it may be as well to lay before our readers the following entry of the time of his birth, which occurs in John Booker's *Astrological Practice Book*, Ashmole MS. 183., p. 373.:—"Oliver Cromwell born 25 Apl. 1599, about 3 o'clock A. M., at Huntington."

In another Ashmole MS. 332, 11 b., which is a collection of figures set by Ashmole himself, Oliver Cromwell's birth is assigned to 22nd April, 1599. The figure is designated by Ashmole, in a spirit very different from that of the annotator of the Baptismal Register, "Nativitas illa magna."

Another minute fact in the history of Cromwell is registered in the same MS. 332., fo. 105.: Oliver Cromwell "received the sword in Westminster Hall, 16th December, 1653, 2° 17′ P. M."

These facts are mentioned in Mr. Black's recent catalogue of the Ashmole MSS. pp. 142. 222.

BATTLE OF TRAFALGAR AND DEATH OF NELSON.

The following letter relates to the important national events of the battle of Trafalgar and death of Nelson. The writer was, at the time, a signal midshipman in the service, and only about thirteen years of age. He was a native of Glasgow, and died many years since, much respected.

H.M.S. Defence,
At anchor off Cadiz, 28 Oct. 1805.

My dear Betty [the writer's sister],

I have now the pleasure of writing you, after a noble victory over the French and Spanish fleets on the 21st October, off Cape Spartel. We have taken, burnt and sunk, gone on shore, &c., twenty-one sail of the line. The names I will let [you] know after. On the 19[th] our frigates made the signal; the Combined Fleets were com-

ing out; so as we are stationed between the frigate and our fleet, we repeated ditto to Lord Nelson. It being calm we could not make much way, but in the course of the night we got a strong breeze, and next morning our frigate made the signal for them, being all at sea. So on the afternoon of the 20[th] we saw them to leeward; but it was blowing fresh and very hazy, so Lord Nelson made our signal for a captain; so our captain went on board, and Lord Nelson told Captain Hope he expected he would keep sight of them all night. So on the morning of the 21st we observed them to leeward about two miles, so we made the signal to Lord Nelson how many the bearings, and everything; so brave Nelson bore down immediately; and at twelve o'clock Lord Nelson broke the south[d] line, and brave Admiral Collin[g]wood the north; and at two o'clock we were all in action. We were the last station'd ship; so when we went down we had two Frenchmen and one Spaniard on us at one time. We engag'd them forty-six minutes, when the "Achille" and "Polyphemus" came up to our assistance. The Spaniard ran away; we gave him chase, and fought him one hour and forty-six minutes, when he struck, and we boarded him, and have him safe at anchor, as we have not had a good wind. I am sorry to say poor Lord Nelson was wounded the second broadside. He went down and got his wounds dress'd, and he was wound'd a second time, and he just lived to hear of the victory. The ship we took, her name is the "San Ildifonzo," eighty-two guns, and a very fine ship, new. I don't think we will save more than twelve sail of them: but we have sunk, burnt, drove on shore, twenty-one sail of the line in all; and if we had not had a gale of wind next day, we would have taken every one of them. We were riding close in shore with two anchors a-head, three cables on each bower, and all our sails were shot to pieces, ditto our rudder and stern, and mainmast, and everything; but, thank good, I am here safe, though there was more shot at my quarters than any other part of the ship. We are now at anchor, but expect to go to Gibraltar every day. I hope in good

you are all in health: I was never better in all my life. My compts to all friends [&c. . . . .] and my dear father and mother.

I am
Your affectionate brother,
(Signed) CHARLES REID.

You must excuse this letter, as half our hands are on board our prize, and have had no time. I have been two days writing this; five minutes one time, and ten minutes another time, and so on. We are just getting under way for Gibraltar.

Now for the French and Spanish ships taken, burnt, run on shore, &c. &c.:—

Bucentaure, 80, taken. French.
Santiss' Trinidada, 130, sunk. Spanish.
Santa, taken, but afterwards got into Cadiz.
Rayo, 110, sunk. French.
Bahama, 74, taken. French.
Argonauta, 80, sunk and burnt.
Neptuna, 90, on shore.
San Ildifonzo, 80, taken by the Defence.
Algazeras, 74, on shore; Swiftsure, 74, Gib.; Berwick, 74, Gib. All English ships taken by the French last war.
Intrepid, 74, burnt.
Aigle, 80, on shore.
Tonguer, 80, on shore [MS. uncertain].
De . . . . . , 74, Gibraltar [ditto].
Argonauta, 74, Gib.
Redoubtable, 74, sunk.
Achell, 74, burnt.
Manarco, 74, on shore.
San Augustino, 74, Gibraltar.

There is not one English ship lost, but a number lost their masts. (Signed) C. R.

The writer had a brother, Andrew Reid, who bore a commission in the ships of Captain Parry in the first Arctic expedition.—(vol. ix. p. 297.)

CROMWELL'S SKULL.

I believe that a skull, maintained by arguments of considerable weight to be the veritable skull of the Protector, is now carefully kept in the hands of some person in London. It is understood that this interesting relic is retained in great secrecy, from the apprehension that a threat, intimated in the reign of George III., that, if made public, it would be seized by government, as the only party to which it could properly belong.

It is to be hoped that the time in which such a threat could be executed has passed by, and that no danger need now be apprehended by the possessor for his open avowal of the facts of the case, such as they are.

Indeed, it seems desirable that, if fair means could lead to such a result, the skull of one who filled so conspicuous a position amongst England's most distinguished rulers, should become public property.

Perhaps some one in possession of the arguments verifying the identity of the skull in question with that of Cromwell, would, by a recapitulation of them, favour some readers of the "N. & Q.," and, amongst others, J.P.

In reply to this query, the following communications were produced: —

J. P. will find valuable information on the subject of Cromwell's skull in an article in the fifth volume of the *Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science* (1848), entitled —

"Historical Notes concerning certain Illnesses, the Death, and Dis-interment of Oliver Cromwell, by W. White Cooper, F.R.C.S."

This article is very ably written, and throws much light on a vexed question. ANTIQUARIUS.—(v. p. 304.)

In answer to J. P., I beg to inform him that the skull of Cromwell is in the possession of W. A. Wilkinson, Esq., of Beckenham, Kent, at whose house a relation of mine saw it. I have no doubt that Mr. Wilkinson would feel plea-

sure in stating the arguments on which the genuineness of the interesting relic is based. L. W.—(v. p. 381.)

The following notices are perhaps worth insertion in relation to this subject:

"The curious head of Cromwell, which Sir Joshua Reynolds has had the good fortune to procure, is to be shown to his majesty. How much would Charles the First have valued the man that would have brought him Cromwell's head!"—*A Newspaper Cutting*, Sept. 1786.

"The Real Embalmed Head of the Powerful and Renowned Usurper, Oliver Cromwell, styled Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland; with the Original Dyes for the Medals struck in honour of his Victory at Dunbar, &c. &c., are now exhibiting at No. 5. in Mead Court, Old Bond Street (where the Rattlesnake was shown last year). A genuine Narrative relating to the Acquisition, Concealment, and Preservation of these Articles, to be had at the place of Exhibition."—*Morning Chronicle*, March 18th, 1799.

H. G. D.—(ix. p. 496.)

The following addition to the notices respecting Cromwell's skull is taken from an *Additional MS.* in the British Museum, and is dated "April 21, 1813." It does not appear that Sir Joshua Reynolds was so desirous of possessing this interesting relic as is stated in your correspondent's "cutting."

"The head of Oliver Cromwell (and it is believed the genuine one) has been brought forth in the city, and is exhibited as a favour to such curious persons as the proprietor chooses to oblige. An offer was made this morning to bring it to Soho Square to show it to Sir Joseph Banks, but he desired to be excused from seeing the remains of the old Villanous Republican, the mention of whose very name makes his blood boil with indignation. The same offer was made to Sir Joseph forty years ago, which he then also refused. The history of this head is as follows: Cromwell was buried in Westminster Abbey, with all the state and solemn ceremony belonging to royalty; at the Restoration, however, his body, and those of some of his associates, were dug up, suspended on Tyburn Gallows for a whole day, and then buried under them; the head of the Arch Rebel, however, was reserved, and a spike having been driven through it, it was fixed at the top of Westminster Hall, where it remained till the great Tempest at the beginning of the 18th century, which blew it

down, and it disappeared, having probably been picked up by some passenger.

"The head in question has been the property of the family to which it belongs for many years back, and is considered by the proprietor as a relic of great value; it has several times been transferred by legacy to different branches of the family, and has lately, it is said, been inherited by a young lady.

"The proofs of its authenticity are as follows: it has evidently been embalmed, and it is not probable that any other head in this island has, after being embalmed, been spiked and stuck up as that of a traitor. The iron spike that passes through it is worn in the part above the crown of the head almost as thin as a bodkin, by having been subjected to the variations of the weather; but the part within the skull, which is protected by its situation, is not much corroded; the wood work, part of which remains, is so much worm-eaten that it cannot be touched without crumbling; the countenance has been compared by Mr. Flaxman, the statuary, with a plaster cast of Oliver's face taken after his death, of which there are several in London, and he declares the features are perfectly similar.

"Mark Noble (whose authority is very questionable) tells us that all the three heads (Cromwell's, Ireton's, and Bradshaw's) were fixed upon Westminster Hall; and he adds, that Cromwell's and Bradshaw's were still there in 1684, when Sir Thomas Armstrong's head was placed between them.

"A ludicrous circumstance occurred not long ago at the British Museum: there is, it seems, in the Ashmole Museum, at Oxford, a skull said to be that of Oliver Cromwell. A visitor at the British Museum, after having seen the curiosities that were there shown him, inquired of the assistant, 'Pray, Sir, have you a skull of Oliver Cromwell in this house?' to which the assistant answered, 'No, Sir.' 'Well, Sir,' said the stranger, 'I wonder at that, *as they have one at the Ashmole Museum at Oxford.*'"

Z. z.—(xii. p. 75.)

PREDICTIONS OF THE FIRE AND PLAGUE OF LONDON.

"It was a trim worke indeede, and a gay world no doubt for some idle cloister-man, mad merry friers, and lusty abbey-lubbers; when themselves were well whittled, and their paunches pretily stuffed, to fall a prophesieing of the woefull dearths, famines, plagues, wars, &c. of the dangerous days imminent." — Harvey's *Discoursive Probleme*, London, 1588.

Among the sly hits at our nation, which abound in the

lively pages of the Sieur d'Argenton, is one to the effect that an Englishman always has an old prophecy in his possession. The worthy Sieur is describing the meeting of Louis X. and our Henry II. near Picquini, where the Chancellor of England commenced his harangue by alluding to an ancient prophecy which predicted that the Plain of Picquini should be the scene of a memorable and lasting peace between the two nations. "The Bishop," says Commines, "commença par une prophétie, dont," adds he, *en parenthèse*, "les Anglois ne sont jamais despourveus."* Even at this early period we had thus acquired a reputation for prophecies; and it must be confessed that our chronicles abound in passages which illustrate the justice of the Sieur's sarcasm. From the days of York and Lancaster, when, according to Lord Northampton, "bookes of beasts and babyes were exceeding ryfe, and current in every quarter and corner of the realme,"† up to the time of Napoleon's projected invasion, when the presses of the Seven Dials were unusually prolific in visions and predictions, pandering to the popular fears of the country — our national character for vaticination has been amply sustained by a goodly array of prophets, real or pretended, whose lucubrations have not even yet entirely lost their influence upon the popular mind. To this day, the ravings of Nixon are "household words" in Cheshire; and I am told that a bundle of "Dame Shipton's Sayings" still forms a very saleable addition to the pack of a Yorkshire pedlar. Recent discoveries in biological science have given to the subject of popular prophecies a philosophical importance beyond the mere curiosity or strangeness of the details. Whether or not the human mind, under certain conditions, becomes endowed with the prescient faculty, is a question I do not wish to discuss: I merely wish to direct attention to a neglected and not uninteresting chapter in the curiosities of literature.

* *Mémoires*, p. 155.: Paris, 1649.

† *Defensative against the Poyson of supposed Prophecies*, p. 116.

In delving among what may be termed the popular religious literature of the latter years of the Commonwealth, and early part of the reign of Charles, we become aware of the existence of a kind of nightmare which the public of that age were evidently labouring under — a strong and vivid impression that some terrible calamity was impending over the metropolis. Puritanic tolerance was sorely tried by the licence of the new Court; and the pulpits were soon filled with enthusiasts of all sects, who railed in no measured terms against the monster city — the city Babylon — the bloody city! as they loved to term her; proclaiming, with all the fervour of fanaticism, that the measure of her iniquities was wellnigh full, and the day of her extinction at hand. The press echoed the cry; and for some years before and after the Restoration, it teemed with "warnings" and "visions," in which the approaching destruction is often plainly predicted. One of the earliest of these prefigurations occurs in that Leviathan of Sermons, *God's Plea for Nineveh, or London's Precedent for Mercy*, by Thomas Reeve: London, 1657. Speaking of London, he says:

"It was Troy-novant, it is Troy le grand, and it will be Troy l'extinct." — p. 217.

And again:

"Methinks I see you bringing pick-axes to dig downe your owne walls, and kindling sparks that will set all in a flame from one end of the city to the other."—P. 214.

And afterwards, in a strain of rough eloquence:

"This goodly city of yours all in shreds, ye may seek for a threshold of your antient dwellings, for a pillar of your pleasant habitations, and not find them; all your spacious mansions and sumptuous monuments are then gone . . . Wo unto us, our sins have pulled down our houses, shaken down our city; we are the most harbourlesse featlesse people in the world . . . Foxes have holes, and the fowls of the air nests, but we have neither; our sins have deprived us both of couch and covert. What inventions shall ye then be put to, to secure yourselves, when your sins shall have shut up all the

conduits of the city, and suffer only the Liver conduit to run*; when they allow you no showers of rain, but showers of blood; when ye shall see no men of your incorporation, but the mangl'd citizen; nor hear no noise in your streets but the crys, the shrieks, the yells and pangs of gasping, dying men; when, amongst the throngs of associates, not a man will own you or come near you," &c.—pp. 221. *et seq.*

After alluding to the epidemics of former ages, he thus alludes to the coming plague:

"It will chase men out of their houses, as if there was some fierce enemy pursuing them, and shut up shop doors, as if execution after judgment was served upon the merchants; there will then be no other music to be heard but doleful knells, nor no other wares to be born up and down but dead corpses; it will change mansion-houses into pest-houses, and gather congregations rather into churchyards than churches . . . The markets will be so empty, that scarce necessaries will be brought in, a new kind of brewers will set up, even apothecaries to prepare diet drinks."—p. 255.

The early Quakers, like most other religious enthusiasts, claimed the gift of prophecy: and we are indebted to members of the sect for many contributions to this branch of literature. Humphrey Smith was one of the most celebrated of the vaticinating Quakers. Little is known of his life and career. He appears to have joined the Quakers about 1654; and after enduring a long series of persecutions and imprisonments for the sake of his adopted creed, finally ended his days in Winchester gaol in 1662. The following passage, from a *Vision which he saw concerning London* (London, 1660), is startling:

"And as for the city, herself and her suburbs, and all that belonged to her, a fire was kindled therein; but she knew not how, even in all her goodly places, and the kindling of it was in the foundation of all her buildings, and there was none could quench it. . . . And the burning thereof was exceeding great, and it burned

* "It was a great contributing to this misfortune that the Thames Water House was out of order, so that the conduits and pipes were almost dry."—*Observations on the Burning of London:* Lond. 1667, p. 34.

inward in a hidden manner which cannot be described. . . . All the tall buildings fell, and it consumed all the lofty things therein, and the fire searched out all the hidden places, and burned most in the secret places. And as I passed through her streets I beheld her state to be very miserable, and very few were those who were left in her, who were but here and there one: and they feared not the fire, neither did the burning hurt them, but they walked as dejected mournful people. . . . And the fire continued, for, though all the lofty part was brought down, yet there was much old stuffe, and parts of broken down desolate walls, which the fire continued burning against. . . . And the vision thereof remained in me as a thing that was showed me of the Lord."

One of the most striking predictions occurs in Daniel Baker's *Certaine Warning for a Naked Heart*, Lond. 1659. After much invective against the evil ways of the metropolis, he proceeds:

"A fire, a consuming fire, shall be kindled in the bowels of the earth, which will scorch with burning heat all hypocrites, unstable, double-minded workers of iniquity. . . . A great and large slaughter shall be throughout the land of darkness where the unrighteous decrees and laws have been founded. Yea, a great effusion of blood, fire, and smoke shall encrease up in the dark habitations of cruelty; howling and great wailing shall be on every hand in all her streets."

Thomas Ellwood disposes of the city in a very summary manner:

"For this shall be judgment of Babylon (saith the Lord); in one day shall her plagues come upon her, *death*, and *mourning*, and famine, and she shall be utterly burnt with fire; for great is the Lord who judgeth her."—*Alarm to the Priests*, Lond. 1662.

George Fox also claims to have had a distinct prevision of the fire. (See *Journal*, p. 386., ed. 1765.) He also relates the story of a Quaker who was moved to come out of Huntingdonshire a little before the fire, and to—

"Scatter his money up and down the streets, turn his horse loose, untie the knees of his breeches, and let his stockings fall down, and to tell the people 'so they should run up and down scattering their money and goods, half undressed, like mad people, as he was a sign to them,' which they did when the city was burning."

Lilly's celebrated book of *Hieroglyphicks*, which pro-

cured the author the dubious honour of an examination before the committee appointed to inquire into the origin of the fire, is well known. In one of the plates, a large city, understood to denote London, is enveloped in flames; and another rude woodcut, containing a large amount of graves and corpses, was afterwards interpreted to bear reference to the Plague. Aubrey seems to be a little jealous of the renown which Lilly acquired by these productions; for he asserts that—

"Mr. Thomas Flatman (poet) did affirm that he had seen those *Hieroglyphicks* in an old parchment manuscript, writ in the time of the monks."—*Misc.*, p. 125., ed. 1721.

Nostradamus also, more than a century before, is said to have foretold the very year of the burning. In the edition, or reputed edition, of 1577, cent. ii. quatrain 51., is the following:

> "Le sang du jusse à Londres fera faute
> Bruslez par foudres de vingt trois les six
> La dame anticque cherra de place haute
> De mesme secte plusieurs seront occis."

Those of your readers who incline to dubiety on this subject, I refer to the copy from whence it was taken, in the Museum Library, press-mark 718. a 14. If it is a forgery (and such I take it to be), it is decidedly the best I ever met with.

I should be glad if any of your correspondents could tell me whether the quatrain above, or anything like it, occurs in any of the *genuine* early editions. Dugdale, by the way, evidently believed in its authenticity, and has inserted a version in his *History of St. Paul's*.

Such a promising theme as the destruction of London was, of course, too good a thing to escape the chap-book makers. During the period of the Civil Wars, we find many allusions to it. In a little quarto brochure, published in 1648, entitled *Twelve Strange Prophecies*, the following is placed in the mouth of the much maligned and carica-

tured Mrs. Ann Shipton. The characteristic termination I consider a fine stroke of the art vaticinatory.

"A ship shall come sayling up the Thames till it come to London, and the master of the ship shall weep, and the mariners shall ask him why he weepeth, and he shall say, 'Ah, what a goodly city was this! none in the world comparable to it! and now there is scarce left any house *that can let us have drinke for our money.*'"

VINCENT T. STERNBERG.—(Vol. vii. pp. 79. 173.)

The vaticinations of this great calamity, and its forerunner the plague, collected by MR. STERNBERG, are interesting, but whether they were uttered before or after the vaticinated events, is now of little consequence. The question, however, is still open. Did the fire originate in accident or design? Historians generally concur in attributing it to the former; but the following seems to point to the latter:

"At the Committee of Trade and Plantations, in the Council Chamber at Whitehall, Thursday the 15th of Dec., 1681: present, His Highness Prince Rupert, Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Craven, &c.

"The petition of Col[l] William Doughty, referr'd by an order of Council of the 18th of Nov. last, is read, wherein, &c.

"Col[l] Doughty does farther acquaint the Co$\bar{m}$mittee, that about two months before the ffire of London, my L[d] Taff's brother, a Capuchin, Col[l] Mort Obryan, and sev[l] others in France, did speak of a great disaster that should happen shortly after in England, and that soon after this discourse he saw at Paris this Capuchin, my L[d] Taff's brother, in gentleman's cloaths and equipage. And as for the particular discourse, he refers himself to a letter written by him the said Col[l] Douglass (*sic*) at that time to Col. Nicholas Carew here in London. Col[l] Doughty does likewise make oath to the truth of what is above mentioned, according to the best of his remembrance; w[ch] their L$\bar{d}$ps agree to report unto his M$\bar{a}$ty in Council to-morrow in the afternoon, and Dr. (*sic*) Nich[s] Carew is appointed to give his attendance at that time."

ERIC.—(x. p. 422.)

Among the examples under this head which have appeared in the "N. & Q.," I think the case has not been mentioned of the Dorsetshire fanatic, John White, of South Perrott, who travelled to London in Dec. 1646, with a view to

destroy the effigy of the Earl of Essex, then lying in state in Westminster Abbey; and having hidden himself in a pew till midnight, set to work with a hatchet. His prediction of the coming vengeance "for the sins and wickedness of London" was very explicit; being revealed to him by an angel, who described the plagues as "so great that they should not be able to bury one another, or else he, the angel, would fire it as he did Sodom and Gomorrah."

J. W.—(vol. xi. p. 341.)

Upon the fly-leaves of a small anti-papal work in my possession, entitled *The Anatomy of Popery* (London, 1673), I find copies of certain letters in MS. which are curious enough to claim a place in "N. & Q." I transcribe them literally:—

"To Mr Sam. Thorlton, A.D. 1666.

"My friend,

"Yr presence is now more nesesary at London yn whare yu are; yt yu may determen how to dispose of yr estate in Southwarke: for it is determened by humen counsell, if not frustrated by devine power that ye suburbes will shortley be destroyd. Yr capacity is large enogh to understand (what) precedes as yr genius shall instruct you.

"Cave. Cave. Fuge. Vale."

The next is much defaced, rendering a perfect transcript impossible; but as it contains some curious matter, I have waded through it, and present it in the clearest state:—

"Sr,

"Yours of ye 6th curent came to me, and broug al ye tydinges of ye borning of London; constantly exspected and discoursd of amongst yu pa To my knowledge for these 18 yeares leyt past as to hapen this year, in wch they doe alsoe promis to ymsels and others ye introduction of ye publick excercise of yr Ca. Religion seated (?) in Wtminster hall, and severall othr places about ye city and elswhare in ye kdom. . . . . .

(*Four lines obscure.*)

continually reproeving their faint-heartednes will rend ym wth sorow and remors, and inflect torments vpon ym equall to ye damned in hell, and will make ym endever to find rest from this angush in ye constant profession of yt truthe wch they have so unhapyly betrayd. And in case of a relaps, they will be constrayned to drag you to ye

place of execution: or els to seke to rid y^mss by a generall massacre, w^ch many good soules have so long disired. I hope S^r y^u will not be wanting in y^r most earnst prayers to beg of God y^t he wold be plesed to take —— of thes misarable wretches, and make the heartes of our G. to relent towards us, y^t he wold convert those who in thaire harts (?) think they do him service by puting us to deth.

"I am, S^r, yors."

Then followeth, as a note, the cruel torturing of a young female for religion's sake; detailed with unpleasant distinctness, and wound up by a metrical warning worth preservation: —

"Down y^u must y^u haritickes,
For all y^r hopes in 66.
The hand ag^st y^u is soe stedy,
For Babylon is faln alredy.
The Divall a mercy is for those
Who holy mother church oppose.
Let not y^r clargy y^u betray,
Y^r eyes are opn — see y^e way,
Retorn in time, if y^u would save
Y^r soules, y^r lives, or ought y^u have.
And if y^u live till 67,
Confess y^u have full warning given:
Then see in time, or ay be blind,
Short time will show w^t is behind.

"Dated y^s 5^th —— in y^e yeare 1666, and y^e first yeare of y^e restoration of y^e Court of Rome in Engld."

G. E. R.— (vol. xii. p. 102.)

WERE CANNON USED AT CRECY?

On a recent visit to the site of the battle, I was informed by a lad (who was playing at the base of the windmill which was the station of King Edward) that balls had been found in the fields on which the battle was fought. I had no opportunity of endeavouring to trace these relics, but it may be easily done; and if the statement is correct, it will decide a question which is still involved in some degree of doubt. S. R. P.— (vol. x. p. 306.)

This has been long a *quæstio vexata*; but notwithstanding the statement of S. R. P., whose informant was a lad, and

such information therefore very problematical, I am inclined to the negative. For not only are our old Latin chroniclers, but our English historians also, as Holinshed and Speed, wholly silent upon this subject. Even Froissart, a cotemporary and a Frenchman, makes no allusion to these terrible thunderbolts of war. Such a statement seems to rest on the one-sided authority of French writers — as Mezerai, Larrey, and others; making it a sort of palliative of this extraordinary defeat of their countrymen. The former says that these hitherto unknown and formidable engines induced them to believe that they were combating with devils rather than men: —

"Les nostres voyant ces instrumens inconnus tonner et vomir tout à la fois des nuées de flame et de fumée, *prirent l'épouvante*, et crurent avoir plutost affaire à des demons qu'à des hommes."

The latter: —

"On dit que ce fut la première fois qu'on se servit de canon dans les batailles, et qu'il y en avoit cinq piéces dans l'armée Angloise, qui contribuèrent beaucoup à augmenter *la terreur des François*," &c.

C. H. — (vol. x. p. 412.)

Villani, an Italian author who died in 1348, states that the English used cannon at Crecy. A passage in the *Chronicles* of St. Denis refers to the use of cannon at Crecy. Nor is Froissart silent on this subject, for in a manuscript of Froissart ("a cotemporary and a Frenchman"), preserved in the library of Amiens, it is distinctly stated that cannon were used by the English at Crecy. The passage I refer to is quoted by Napoleon (the present emperor) in his work on Artillery, and runs thus: —

"Et li Angles descliquèrent aucun cannons qu'ils avaient en la bataille pour esbahir les Genevois."

which may be translated: —

"And the English caused to fire suddenly certain guns which they had in the battle, to astonish (or confound) the Genoese."

R. A. — (vol. x. p. 534.)

CAPTURE OF HENRY THE SIXTH.

At Waddington in Mytton stands a pile of building known as the "Old Hall," once antique, but now much indeed despoiled of its beauty, where for some time the unfortunate king, Henry the Sixth, was concealed after the fatal battle of Hexham, in Northumberland. Quietly seated one day at dinner, "in company with Dr. Manning, Dean of Windsor, Dr. Bedle, and one Ellarton," his enemies came upon him by surprise; but he privately escaped by a back door, and fled to Bungerley stepping-stones (still partially visible in a wooden frame), where he was taken prisoner, "his legs tied together under the horse's belly," and thus disgracefully conveyed to the Tower in London. He was betrayed by one of the Talbots of Bashall Hall. This ancient house or hall is still in existence, but now entirely converted into a building for farming purposes: "Sic transit gloria mundi." Near the village of Waddington there is still to be seen a meadow known by the name of "King Henry's Meadow."

In Baker's *Chronicle* the capture of the king is described as having taken place "in *Lincolnshire*;" but this is evidently incorrect; it is Waddington in Mytton, West Yorkshire. CLERICUS CRAVENSIS.—(vol. ii. p. 181.)

This note led to the following:—

The particulars of the king's capture are thus related in the chronicle called Warkworth's *Chronicle*, which has been printed by the Camden Society:—

"Also, the same yere, kynge Henry was takene bysyde a howse of religione [*i. e.* Whalley] in Lancashyre, by the mene of a blacke monke of Abyngtone [Abingdon] in a wode called Cletherwode [the wood of Clitheroe], besyde Bungerly hyppyngstones, by Thomas Talbott, sonne and heyre to sere Edmunde Talbot of Basshalle, and Jhon Talbott, his cosyne, of Colebry [*i. e.* Salebury, in Blackburn], withe other moo; which discryvide [him] beynge at his dynere at Wadyngton halle: and [he was] carryed to London on horsebake, and his leges bownde to the styropes."

I have substituted the word "discryvide" for "disseyvide,"

as it is printed in the Camden Society's book, where the editor, Mr. Halliwell, understood the passage as meaning that the king was deceived or betrayed. I take the meaning to be, that the black monk of Abingdon had descried, or discovered, the king as he was eating his dinner in Waddington Hall; whereupon the Talbots, and some other parties in the neighbourhood, formed plans for his apprehension, and arrested him on the first convenient opportunity, as he was crossing the ford across the river Ribble formed by the hyppyngstones at Bungerley. Waddington belonged to Sir John Tempest, of Bracewell, who was the father-in-law of Thomas Talbot. Both Sir John Tempest and Sir James Harrington of Brierley, near Barnsley, were concerned in the king's capture, and each received one hundred marks' reward; but the fact of Sir Thomas Talbot being the chief actor is shown by his having received the larger reward of 100*l*. Further particulars respecting these and other parties concerned will be found in the notes to Warkworth's *Chronicle*. The chief residence of the unhappy monarch during his retreat was at Bolton Hall, where his boots, his gloves, and a spoon are still preserved, and are engraved in Whitaker's *Craven*. An interior view of the ancient hall at Bolton, which is still remaining, is engraved in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1841. Sir Ralph Pudsay of Bolton had married Margaret, daughter of Sir Thomas Tunstal, who attended the king as esquire of the body. JOHN GOUGH NICHOLS.—(vol. ii. p. 228.)

There was also a grant of lands made by King Edward IV. to Sir James Harrington,—

"For his services in taking prisoner, and withholding as such in diligence and valour, his enemy Henry, lately called King Henry VI."

This grant, which was confirmed in Parliament, embraced the castle, manor, and domain of Thurland; a park, called Fayzet Whayte Park, with lands, &c. in six townships in the county of Lancaster; lands at Burton in Lonsdale, co. York; and Holme, in Kendal, co. Westmoreland, the for-

feited lands of Sir Richard Tunstell, and other "rebels." So considerable a recognition of the services of Sir James Harrington would seem to demand something more than the second-rate position given to them by your correspondent. The order to give Sir James Harrington possession of the lands under his grant will be found in Rymer. The grant itself is printed in the *Nugæ Antiquæ*, by Henry Harrington, 1775 (vol. ii. p. 121.), and will, I believe, be found in Baines' *Lancashire*. Mr. Henry Harrington observes, that the lands were afterwards lost to his family by the misfortune of Sir James and his brother being on the wrong side at Bosworth Field; after which they were both attainted for serving Richard III. and Edward IV., "and commanding the party which seized Henry VI. and conducted him to the Tower."

H. K. S. C.—(vol. ii. p. 316.)

ABDICATION OF JAMES II.

The following Note was drawn up by the late Sir Harris Nicolas, and printed in the *Proceedings* of the late Record Commissioners. Only fifty copies were printed for the use of the Commissioners, and a copy is rarely met with. Sir Harris Nicolas, as editor of the *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, would doubtless, had that work been continued to 1688, have used the MSS. if attainable.

"Notice of Manuscript in the possession of the Rev. Sir Thomas Miller, Bart., containing the original Minutes of the Assembly of Peer and Privy Councillors that met at Guildhall, upon the flight of James II. from London.

"Extracts from Memorandum of a MS. in the possession of the Rev. Sir Thomas Miller, Bart., shown to Mr. Cooper, Secretary to the Record Commissioners, to Sir Harris Nicolas, and to Mr. Hardy, in 1833, at Sir Thomas Miller's lodgings in the Edgeware Road.

"Immediately after the flight of James the Second from London, on the 11th of December, 1688, a tumult arose among the citizens which created considerable alarm; and with the view of preserving the peace, of imparting public confidence, and of providing for the

extraordinary state of affairs, all the Peers and Privy Councillors then in the vicinity of the metropolis assembled at Guildhall. Of this important Assembly Bishop Burnet's notice is very brief, and it would appear from his statement that it was called by the Lord Mayor.* A more full account of the Convention is, however, given in the Memoir of James the Second published by Dr. Clarke: 'It 'seems, upon the King's withdrawing from London, the lords about 'town met at Guildhall to consult what was fit to be done. They 'looked upon the present state of affairs as an interregnum, that the 'government was in a manner devolved upon them, and were in 'great haste to make a present of it to the Prince of Orange.' Other acts of this Assembly are then mentioned; and its proceedings are among the most interesting and important events in English history, not only from their forming a precedent in a conjuncture of affairs which no express provision is to be found in the constitution, but in the first regular offer of the throne to the Prince of Orange ing emanated from this Convention. No Record of its proceedin has, it is presumed, been hitherto known to exist; and the fact th so valuable a Document is extant, cannot be too generally sta for it is obvious that it has high claims to the attention of hist ns.

"Thomas Miller possesses the original Minutes of this Assemb the Peers in the handwriting of a Mr. Glyn, who acted as secret His appointment to that situation is also preserved; and, as it is ed by all the Lords who were present, it affords evidence of the s of the Peers who took part in the business of the Assembly, contains a very interesting collection of autographs.

"The itself is a small folio, but not above fifty pages are filled. prises the period between the 11th and the 28th December, both days inclusive, and appears to be a perfect Record of every that memorable Assembly. The indorsement on the cover mer tice: it states with singular minuteness the precise hour of Ja bdication, namely, at *one in the morning* of the 11th of Decembe ."

* After m ng the excesses committed by the mob, and the arrest of Jud ries, Bishop Burnet says:—"The Lord Mayor was so struck e terror of this rude populace, and with the disgrace of a man d made all people tremble before him, that he fell into fits up which he died soon after.

"To prevent ther growth of such disasters, he called a Meeting of the P uncillors and Peers, who met at Guildhall," &c. The pronou st relate to the Lord Mayor, but the sentence is obscurely ed.

Sir Thomas Miller also possessed a manuscript containing an "Account of the Earl of Rochester, Captain Kendall, and the Narrator's Journey to Salisbury with King James, Monday, Nov. 19. to Friday, Nov. 23. 1688, inclusive."

In connection with this subject, it may be noticed that there is no entry of any payment in the *Issue Books* of the clerks of the Pells between Tuesday, 11th December, and Monday, 24th December, 1688. J. E.—(vol. i. p. 39.)

REMARKS ON CROWNS, AND MORE PARTICULARLY O' THE ROYAL OR IMPERIAL CROWN OF GREAT BRITAI

(From the Autograph MS. of Stephen Martin Leake, Esq., GART.)

As to crowns in general, the first kind of crowns wor[n] by kings was the diadem, which was no other than a fi[llet] of silk, linen, or the like. Pliny supposes it to be as [ancient] as Bacchus for a general ensign of kings. Nor ap[pears] it, says Selden, that any other kind of crown was u[sed] for a royal ensign, except only in some kingdoms of A[sia]. The Romans conceived this kind of fillet to be the [proper] ensign of a king, and therefore endured not th[e use] of it whilst they hated the name of king. Hence it [is] that the emperors at first abstain from the diadem. [Julius] first put it on, but durst not continue it, nor did [his] afterwards publicly affect it for 280 years. The first th[at wore] it, and sometimes perhaps publicly, was Aurelian[, but] not constantly; nor had the emperors yet any oth[er] sign of dignity for their heads besides the laurel [or] the radiated crown, neither of which were proper to t[he] as ensigns of the monarchy; the first being only tri[bu]l, as imperatores or generals of the state, and the ot[her] note of flattery, deifying them as gods. But soon aft[er] relian, the diadem in Constantine the Great becam[e] tinual wearing, and was in common use. Constanti[us] used a diadem of pearls and rich stones, as appears [in] his coins; afterwards the imperial diadem received [va]ions of other parts that went from ear to ear over th[e] n of the head, and at length over a gold helm with [a] which made it some-

what like a close crown of later times. Constantine appears with the diadem and helm in this manner upon some of his coins; but the frequent joining of the helm and cap to the diadem, according to Selden, was not till about the time of the younger Theodosius; the use of crowns thus deduced from Constantine the Great was an example which the rest of the kings of Europe followed.

Geoffrey of Monmouth (lib. i.) and Hector Boetius (lib. ii. & x.) tell us that Dunvallo Mulmutius, King of Britain, and the old kings of Scotland, even from Fergus I., used a gold crown; but these testimonies, says Selden, are not clear enough in credit; and admit as a variety that of King Arthur's crown, which Leland says he saw in his seal (*Assert. Arth.*, p. 12.). But it appears, by our old British coins, that the diadem, or fillet of pearls, was worn by Cunobeline, King of Britain, who flourished under Augustus and Tiberius, brought up it is said in the court of Augustus, and died A. D. 22; so that the fillet was in use with us after the common fashion of other nations, and it appears to have been in use in the elder times of the Saxon. Upon a coin of Adulph, King of the East Angles, who began his reign A.D. 664, he appears with the plain fillet or diadem. Offa, King of the Mercians, A. D. 763, has a fillet of pearls, sometimes a double row, and sometimes single. Kenwolf, A. D. 794, has a double row. Cuthred, King of Kent, who died A. D. 805, has the diadem with a double row of pearl; Bertulf and Burgred, Kings of Mercia, the first a single, the latter a double row of pearl; but King Egbert, who about A.D. 800 became the sole monarch of the Heptarchy, appears upon his coins with a radiated crown, the rays being much shorter than those of the Roman emperors; and probably, as being sole monarch, he assumed this crown by way of eminence and distinction from the other kings of the Heptarchy in subjection to him; but this sort of crown was peculiar to him. Athelwolf, his son, had the fillet or diadem with a double row of pearl, and a large jewel for an ornament in the front. Elfred*, or

* The print of Alfred by Vertue, taken from an ancient picture preserved in University College, Oxon, has his head crowned with

Alfred the Great, has the plain fillet. Edward the Elder appears upon his money sometimes in a helmet with a plain fillet, which helmet on some coins appears like an arched crown. Athelstan seems to have the cap and helmet resembling an arched crown, and King Edmund, his brother, has the same. Edred, A.D. 946, has the fillet and cap, with three high rays and pearls on the points, somewhat like our earls' coronets; his successors, Edgar the Peaceable, Edward the Martyr, and Ethelred, have plain diadems. Edmund Ironside has a crown with three rays like Edred. Cnut appears upon his money either in a helmet, or with a plain fillet, sometimes with a single row of pearl. Harold has the same upon a helmet, with a jewel, or such like ornament, in the front of it; but sometimes the plain diadem and cap arched with pearl, and also three rays with pearls on the points. Hardicanute has the diadem with one row of pearl. Edward the Confessor upon some coins has a coronet of open crown fleuri, with three fleurs-de-lis, one in the middle, and one, or rather, as they appear, half flowers, at each end: on others he has a high pointed helmet, which sometimes appears like an arched crown; but upon his great seal he has another kind of ornament upon his head, a cap and a crown on it, says Selden, in a strange form, unless perhaps the cutter of the stamp meant it for such a one as William the Conqueror's; and indeed it bears so near a resemblance to it, that there is all the reason in the world to think so, and consequently that it is not a cap and a crown, but a helmet adorned with a fillet, and thereon three high raised points, that in the middle of the front, which is the highest, terminating in a cross, the other two at the sides being like rays inverted; the points being downwards may probably be designed for nails, for such we see accompanying the cross upon the reverse of some coins of the Conqueror. But after the Confessor,

an open crown composed of fleurs-de-lis, and lesser flowers between, which rather proves the picture modern than the crown ancient: the draught of an ancient stone bust of him in the same print seems to have only a cap or plain fillet, like his money.

Harold appears with the diadem of one row of pearls, and on some of his money, says Selden, bears the diadem of pearls upon a helm ; and this on a helm, says Selden, I conceive to be properly that which they called *cynehelme*, as the diadem without the helm, that which was their *cynebœnd*, or royal fillet, for those two words with the Saxons denoted a royal ensign of the head ; and the royal helmet, I apprehend, is what we see upon the great seal of Edward the Confessor and the Conqueror.

After the Norman Conquest the first William appears upon his great seal with a helmet and diadem composed of a circle and three rays raised very high, their points terminating in crosses, having a pearl or pellet at each point of the cross, and two fleurs-de-lis between the rays. Selden calls this likewise a cap with a crown ; but it is manifestly a helmet, and of the same form as that he wears upon the counterseal. This seems to have been compounded of the royal helmet and crown fleuri of Edward the Confessor ; but on the coins attributed to this first William (supposing all those with the full face to be his), he appears in a cap, or the crown of the head appearing like one, having a pearled diadem with one row of pearls, and three larger pearls upon the upper part of the diadem, one at each end, and one in the middle, after the manner they are now placed upon our barons' coronets, having likewise labels of pearl, like earrings, hanging at each ear ; others have three rays with pearls on the points, and some seem to have flowers or leaves between. Some have thought what I call a cap to be an arched crown, and Selden thought it to be an arch that went across the head, as is frequently seen in those of the Eastern emperors ; but we have no instance of arched crowns with us, upon the great seals or otherwise, till long afterwards, nor has this the form of such an arch as he supposes. In some coins it makes a double arch by sinking in the middle, which shows it was intended to represent a cap which naturally falls into that shape ; some have likewise three rays with pearls at the points. William Rufus upon his great seal has a coronet with high rays and

pearls upon the points, like those of Edred and Edmund Ironside, with this difference, that they had but three rays, and Rufus's crown has five: the coins attributed to him having his head in profile have, some of them, the cap like an arched crown, the arch being composed of pearls, but without any ornament at the top, which all arched crowns are supposed to have, and therefore, as well as for the reasons before mentioned, I cannot admit it to be any other than a cap.

Henry I., both upon his great seal and money, has the open crown fleuri with three fleurs-de-lis, one in the middle, and half flowers at each end; the fillet is usually plain, but some of his coins show a single row of pearls, like Edward the Confessor, upon whose coins it first appeared. And of this crown with fleurs-de-lis it is remarkable, as Selden observes, that though the coins of the Saxon times show us no other than what we have mentioned: yet there are extant some volumes written under King Edgar, and by his command, touching the reformation of the monastic life in England, wherein he is pictured, and in a draught of his own time, with a crown fleuri, also rudely drawn. And whencesoever it proceeded, the crowns that are put on the heads of most ancient kings in pictures of the holy story of Genesis (*MSS. in Bibl. Cottoniana*), translated into Saxon in those times, and in such draughts as designed the holy story belonging to the Psalms of near or about a thousand years since, are no otherwise than fleurs-de-lis. This ancient use and attribute of the crown fleuri with fleurs-de-lis to the sacred history, and the fleur-de-lis being likewise an ancient emblem of the Trinity, was perhaps the reason that King Edward assumed it, and that it was afterwards used, and is still continued, as an ornament in the crowns of almost all the Christian princes.

The Empress Maud appears upon her great seal with a like crown fleuri, quite open (without either a cap or the crown of the head appearing through it), and a very small ray or low point between the fleurs-de-lis.

King Stephen upon his great seal has a like crown with three fleurs-de-lis; the draught in Speed shows the crown of the head through it, but Sandford's draught does not.

The crown is quite open as the coin in Speed has it, but upon some of his coins the fleurs-de-lis appear raised very high upon stems or stalks; some have the diadem plain, others have a double row of pearls and a cap like an arched crown, the arch composed of pearls; but by the height of the fleurs-de-lis of the diadem or coronet, which rise considerably above the arch, as well as for other reasons mentioned before, it cannot be considered as an arched crown; besides that the arched crown is not of very ancient use but in the Empire. The French kings did not use it before Francis I. (though M. Le Blanc gives us some double ducats and testoons of Louis XII.), nor did it come into constant use with them before Henry II., and therefore these supposed arches of King Stephen's crown are owing to the fancy of the workman, or were designed to express the cap or covering of the head.

The great seal of King Henry II. has the open crown with three fleurs-de-lis, the diadem set with pearls; but his son Henry, crowned king in his father's lifetime, appears upon his great seal with a crown having short rays between the fleurs-de-lis, like that of Maud the Empress, his mother: his money is supposed to have the same fashioned crown as Henry I.'s money, but his effigies upon his tomb at Font Evrard*, in Normandy, according to the draught in Sandford, has a crown of leaves. This monument, says he, was erected A.D. 1638 by the lady abbess, when the effigy was removed from the place where it was first fixed; but from the fashion of the crown I should rather think the effigies were no older than the monument, or at least not so old as the original monument.

Richard I. has the open crown with three fleurs-de-lis upon both his great seals, the diadem or fillet being plain in one, but in the others set with pearls.†

* Vertue's draught of his monumental figure, taken from Montfaucon's *Antiquities*, has leaves with lesser leaves upon points between.

† Vertue's draught of the effigies of Richard I., from his monument at Font Evrard, has the crown with three leaves and small points

King John* on his great seal has the crown with three short rays, the fillet set with pearls, and a cap, or the crown of the head like a cap, appearing through it, which was not in any of the former. But upon his effigies on his tomb in the cathedral of Worcester, which Sandford thinks as old as Henry III., the coronet is composed of leaves close together, and all of an equal height: this is the more probable, because King Henry III. used a crown with leaves, and the monument of this king being erected in the reign of King Henry III., had the crowns made according to the fashion then used. Upon his coins King John has the crown fleuri.

Henry III. upon his first great seal has the open crown and plain diadem. Selden describes it as a crown fleuri pointed or rayed, and the points or rays are raised, but not high, between the flowers; but it appears by the draught to be composed of leaves exactly resembling the leaves upon our dukes' coronets, three in number, with very short rays or points between: and his second great seal is like the first, only it wants the points or rays between the leaves. But the crown on the head of his effigies of copper gilt, on his tomb at Westminster, by Sandford's draught seems to be fleuri with fleurs-de-lis, and so it is by Vertue's draught†; but, by his print of this king from the same

between; but, for the reasons before mentioned under his father, the antiquity of the figure may be questioned. Hoveden and Diceto, who were both present at the coronation of King Richard I., tell us that Geoffry de Lucy bore the royal cap in the procession, and William de Mandeville, Earl of Albemarle and Essex, bore a large crown of gold set with precious stones; which cap was first put upon his head, and some time after the crown.—*Rapin*, 245.

* Vertue admires the likeness of this king upon his statue and great seal, so conformable with each other. I as much admire that the crowns upon their heads are so very different. John was first crowned Duke of Normandy at Rouen, and Matt. Paris says, with a golden circle or coronet adorned all round with golden roses curiously wrought.

† Vertue's draughts from his monumental statue or brass, erected at great cost and care to his memory (who built a great part of

statue, Matt. Paris says this king was the first crowned with a *circulus aureus*. His crown upon his money is only a plain *circulus aureus*, or fillet, with a pearl at each end and a fleur-de-lis in the middle.

Edward I. has the open crown upon his great seal, having a plain fillet, and adorned with what I take to be leaves, like his predecessor: but in Speed's draught the fillet is set with pearl, and a cap on the head appears through it: his coins have the open crown with fleurs-de-lis; some have rays between, and some pearls on the points. The groat of this king has the crown with leaves five in number, viz. three entire leaves and two half leaves at each end. The seal of Queen Eleanora, his first wife, has three leaves or flowers upon the plain fillet, and so has the crown upon her effigies on her tomb in Westminster Abbey.*

Edward II.'s great seal has the open crown with three leaves and plain fillet (Speed's adorned), and very small points just rising between the leaves, and the crown upon his head; on his monument at Gloucester, entire and well preserved according to Vertue's draught, appears the same fashioned crown; and his coins seem to have the crown with fleurs-de-lis and pearls upon points between.†

Westminster Abbey), has the open crown with five leaves and low rays between.

* The draught of the remains of his statue over the gate of Caernarvon Castle, as taken by Vertue, has the open crown with three leaves, low points, between the fillets, adorned with jewels.

† At the coronation of King Edward II., Gaveston carried the crown of St. Edward, with which the king was to be crowned, an honour that by ancient custom belonged to the princes of the blood. The king gave to Gaveston the crown jewels with the crown of his father, which he sent beyond sea for his own use.—*Walter de Hemingford, Tyrrel, Walsingham.*

This is the first mention of King Edward's crown at the coronation, and it does not appear that King John used it; it is probable King Henry III. first used it, who named his son Edward after Edward I., in memory of him, and ever honoured him as his tutelar saint.

Edward III. upon his first great seal has the coronet and cap with the three leaves or flowers, and lesser fleurs-de-lis between, all somewhat raised upon points; but his second great seal has the open crown with three fleurs-de-lis, and small points just rising between the flowers, and his third great seal, which bears the title of France as well as England, has the open crown with five leaves or flowers raised upon points, whereas on the former crowns they lay almost close upon the fillet.* And the seal of Queen Philippa has very distinctly five ducal leaves, somewhat raised upon points like the king's; but her effigies upon her monument in Westminster Abbey have a crown of fleurs-de-lis and crosses, as seems by the draught in Sandford. Some have attributed the first use of the imperial or arched crown to King Edward III., for no other reason, as I conceive, but because he was made Vicar-General of the Empire, by the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria; but there is not the least proof of it. We have shown what crowns are upon his great seals; and upon his money he used a crown with three fleurs-de-lis, like his second great seal, with rays between, and sometimes pearls upon the points.†

Richard II. upon his great seal has the open crown with three flowers or leaves, but most resembling the latter. Upon his money he appears with a crown like that of his grandfather King Edward III. upon his money. In that most ancient original picture of this king in the Jerusalem

* Vertue's draught from an ancient painting in Windsor Castle gives him a crown open with fleurs-de-lis and leaves alternately, and pearls upon small points between; but this was probably the painter's own composition.

† It appears by several instruments in Rymer, that this king (Edward III.) frequently pawned his crown to raise money; as in his ninth year, "duas coronas aureas," which had been pawned for 8000 marks; and in his fourteenth year his crown, called "Magna corona regis," to the Archbishop of Treves for 25,000 florins: and the crown of Philippa his queen, and a smaller crown pawned at Cologne; and the same crown, called "Magna Corona Angliæ," was pawned in his eighteenth year.

Chamber, he has an open crown, with five high rays and small flowers upon the points, or rather leaves, the three nearest resembling ducal leaves, and the two others more like trefoils, which shows how little we can depend upon such draughts, or even statues, for the fashion of the crowns.

Henry IV. has upon his great seal the open crown, with three leaves or flowers, as King Richard II.; and his coins have the same crown as the money of the two preceding kings. The crown upon his head on his tomb at Canterbury, is composed of leaves with very low points rising between.

Henry V.* The great seal of King Henry V. has the crown with three leaves or flowers, more resembling fleur-de-lis than his father's, with smaller flowers or leaves between; but that they were all intended for leaves, appears by the seal of Queen Catherine his wife, which has very distinctly five large leaves like ducal leaves, with lesser leaves between, and the fillet or circle adorned with jewels.† The crown of this king upon his money is as his father's upon his money; his effigies upon his monument in Westminster Abbey is headless, for having been of silver, it was stolen away the latter end of the reign of King Henry VIII.; but if the draught in Sandford be right, it had an imperial or arched crown, with the orb and cross at the top, and composed of crosses paté and fleurs-de-lis, as used at this day; and Sandford tells us this draught was supplied from an ancient picture of this king in the royal palace in Whitehall, which I apprehend was destroyed when that palace was burnt down. If that picture was

* Henry V., in the third year of his reign, raised money upon his crown called "La Corown Henry;" and the same year pledged, as a security for 1000 marks, "Unum Magnum Circulum Aureum Garnizatum."— *Rymer.*

† Nevertheless an ancient picture upon board of this king, now in the palace of Kensington, of which Vertue has given us a draught, with his heads of the English kings, has the cap and coronet, with three fleurs-de-lis, and lesser flowers or leaves between, all round a little above the circle.

indeed an original, it confirms what Selden says he had read in a book of the institution of the Garter under Henry VIII., that Henry V. first made him an imperial crown. However that be, none but the old open crown appears either upon his great seal or his money.*

Henry VI. The crown on his head, and likewise over two escocheons upon his great seal, are open crowns, with three fleurs-de-lis, and two short rays between, with pearls upon the points, and the same upon his money, for though some coins with the arched crown have been attributed to this prince, it is certain by their weight they belong to Henry VII.

Edward IV. His English money has the same old open crown as his predecessors', but some of his Irish coins have on the reverse three crowns, composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis; which three crowns, Selden says, were for his three dominions of England, France, and Ireland. His great seal has the crown with five leaves, and a treble arch surmounted by the orb and cross. The seal of Elizabeth Widvile, his queen, has a coronet composed of crosses paté and fleurs-de-lis alternately, with lesser fleurs-de-lis between, all somewhat raised upon points. This crown of King Edward IV. is the first instance of an arched crown upon the great seal.†

Richard III. Upon his money he has the old open crown as his predecessor, and upon his great seal an arched

* Upon the tomb of Margaret, Countess of Richmond, mother to King Henry VII., who died 1 Henry VIII., the arms of Henry V. and Queen Catherine are placed on the south side, under a double-arched crown, composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis, which probably was taken from that ancient picture, or that picture probably not older than the time of Henry VII. or VIII.

† Selden, mistaking the coins of Henry VII. for Henry VI., attributes the first use of the arched crown to Henry VI.; but I have seen, says he, several copies of the "Ordo Coronationis" of the kings and queens of England, written much ancienter than Henry VI., and in them the King sitting on his throne and crowned with the crown fleuri, not without an arch, having a globe or mound with the cross on the top of it, and the draughts seem as old as the copies.

crown composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis, three crosses appearing, one in front, and one at each end, and two fleurs-de-lis between. The arch is treble, like Edward IV.'s on his great seal, but something more modern in the fashion of the arch, which in this is broader, and not so acute at the top. This crown of Richard III. is the first upon the great seal composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis.*

Henry VII. The first money of this king has the old open crown, with fleurs-de-lis and pearls upon points between; afterwards the crown appears to be composed of leaves and pearls upon points, sometimes with the single arch, adorned with little crosses placed saltire-ways, and the coronet composed of crosses patonce, a larger and a smaller alternately, for such upon a strict examination sometimes they will appear to be, though at first sight they have the resemblance of leaves, and sometimes they have the double arch. The crown upon his great seal has crosses paté and fleurs-de-lis, like that of King Richard III., but the arches more acute, like that of King Edward IV. A crown of this fashion, but without arches, is over the entrance of the screen or inclosure of his famous tomb† in the chapel of his name at Westminster. The crown on the head of his effigies is double-arched, composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis alternately, with lesser fleurs-de-lis between; the same is at the foot of the tomb, both surmounted with the orb and cross. The crown at the head of his tomb, instead of lesser fleurs-de-lis, has lesser crosses between. As to the arches, Sandford's draught of his great seal has one arch; Speed's draught has two, and the same difference appears upon his money. The like is to be observed in the crowns of his predecessors, by which it appears no certain form was constantly observed, but from this time the arched crown with

* At the coronation he offered or laid down King Edward's crown at St. Edward's Shrine, and put on another. — Buck's *Life of Richard III.*

† The crown over his arms upon the tomb of his mother the Countess of Richmond at Westminster, has the double arch with crosses and fleurs-de-lis.

crosses paté and fleurs-de-lis has been used with very little variation, either upon seals or coins, except upon the first money of King Henry VIII. The crowns upon the effigies of the kings on the walls of Henry VII.'s chapel at Westminster, were, as Selden thinks, all alike, and only fleuri with crosses, and the arched crown then in use omitted as too troublesome, the cutter choosing to make them handsome and alike, than such as were proper for every king. Indeed, very little regard is to be had to such representation unless corroborated by other proofs.

Henry VIII. upon his great seal has the arched crown with crosses and fleurs-de-lis as his father, and the same over two escocheons, viz. the cross in front, two others at each end, and fleurs-de-lis between. Upon his money the crown appears in different forms, his first money with the half face has usually the arched crown with leaves, and low points with pearls; a crown of the double rose has leaves and fleurs-de-lis, and on the reverse of the same coin leaves only, but most commonly the crown upon his money is composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis, and generally with one arch *; the same difference appears upon his medals. A medallion in Evelyn, No. 2., has an open crown with leaves, or ducal coronet, in the space behind his head; for upon his head he has a cap, and upon the reverse is a coronet, with leaves and pearls upon points between. Another famous medallion, No. 4., struck upon his taking the title of Supreme Head of the Church, has his head with a cap encompassed with a circle or diadem radiated with small rays.

Edward VI. has the same double-arched crown upon his great seal as his father King Henry VIII., and upon his money he has usually the same fashioned crown with the single arch; but there is a sovereign of his sixth year

* The crown over his arms upon the tomb of his grandmother, the Countess of Richmond, erected by this prince, is double-arched, with crosses and fleurs-de-lis, and lesser flowers between; his father's upon the same tomb having only crosses with fleurs-de-lis.

where on the treble arch appears, and another whereon the crown seems to be composed of leaves and crosses.

Queen Mary has the same double-arched crown upon her great seal as her brother King Edward VI., and her father and grandfather, Kings Henry VII. and VIII.; and the same upon her money, except her sovereign in Evelyn, No. 7., which he calls a ryal, which has leaves only; and her coins have usually the crown with the single arch.

Queen Elizabeth's great seal has the same crown as her sister, brother, and father, with the triple arch; the same upon her monument at Westminster, and upon her money. A sixpence, 1573, has fluers-de-lis and crosses with the double arch, and the ryal, or noble, has the old open crown with three leaves. A medal in Evelyn, No. 9., has the crown with leaves only and the double arch; another, No. 14., has crosses and fleurs-de-lis; No. 16. has leaves and pearls upon points with the treble arch, and No. 17. the same with a single arch.

King James I. has the same sort of treble-arched crown upon his great seal as Queen Elizabeth, composed of crosses and fleurs-de-lis, and the same upon his English money; but upon his money coined in Scotland the crown is composed of fleurs-de-lis and crosses: there is a unite with a crown of leaves only. The medal of Queen Anne (Evelyn, No. 23.) has a coronet or open crown, with three leaves and two C's indorsed and interlinked, saltire-wise.

King Charles I. used the same fashioned crown as his father upon his great seal, with this difference only, that his first great seal shows the triple arch; but his second great seal, having the date 1640, has the double arch as it has been represented ever since. His money has the same difference in the crown as his father's, namely, those of Scotland having fleurs-de-lis and crosses instead of crosses and fleurs-de-lis. The same difference is observable upon his Scotch coronation medal; two of the medals (Evelyn, Nos. 25. and 27.) have the crown with crosses, fleurs-de-lis, and pearls upon points between them.

The usurper, Oliver Cromwell, likewise assumed the double-arched crown, with crosses, fleurs-de-lis, and small rays between, with pearls on the points.

King Charles II.'s coronation medal has the triple-arched crown, with crosses, fleurs-de-lis, and small pearls upon low points between, but upon others only crosses and fleurs-de-lis, and the same upon his money; the like double-arched crown, with crosses and fleurs-de-lis, appear upon both his great seals, as the same has been since continued without any variation.

Besides the royal or imperial crown, there was an ancient crown called St. Edward's crown, that is, the crown, of King Edward the Confessor, with which our kings were crowned; but whether it was really the Confessor's crown, and constantly used from that time at their coronations, has been questioned.

The coronation of King Richard I. is related by Hoveden and Diceto, and mention made of the royal cap, the gold spurs, the royal sceptre, the golden rod with a dove at the top, and the crown, which it is said was taken from beside the altar, but not called St. Edward's or King Edward's crown; though, the regalia being the same as was afterwards called St. Edward's and attended with the same ceremonies, and in the custody of the church of Westminster, they were probably the same.

King Henry III. was crowned at Gloucester by reason of the war then subsisting with the barons, and his father King John's crown having been lost in crossing the Well stream from Lynn into Lincolnshire, they were forced to use a plain circle or chaplet of gold, because they had neither the time nor means to make a better; the reason therefore why he was not crowned with King Edward's crown is obvious, because he was not crowned at Westminster, where the royal regalia was deposited.*

The first mention of St. Edward's crown is at the coronation of King Edward II.: that Gaveston carrying the

* Matt. Paris, T. Wikes, Rapin.

crown of St. Edward with which the king was to be crowned, an honour that by ancient custom belonged to the princes of the blood (Walsingham in *Rymer*, vol. iii. p. 63.); which implies it was esteemed an ancient crown at that time.

In the ceremonial of the coronation of King Richard II. (Cerem. No. 1. in Off. Arm.), there is no mention of St. Edward's crown; but in that of King Henry VI. it is said (W. Y. in Off. Arm.), they set on his head St. Edward's crown, and after that another which King Richard had made for himself; which shows it was usual to crown our kings with two crowns,—St. Edward's, and the royal or imperial crown.

King Richard III. and King Henry VIII. are mentioned to have been crowned with St. Edward's crown* (Cerem. No. I.); Queen Anne Bullen was crowned with St. Edward's crown (W. Y. fo. 72.); King Edward VI. was crowned with three crowns, viz. King Edward's crown, the imperial crown of the realm of England, and the third very rich, which was purposely made for him. St. Edward's staff is likewise mentioned. Queen Mary had likewise three crowns, St. Edward's, the imperial, and a third made for herself. She had likewise St. Edward's staff, and the paten of St. Edward's chalice, which is likewise mentioned under Henrys VI. and VIII., and Edward VI., and was a holy relic of great antiquity (probably as old as the Confessor) and of great value, for in the account of the coronation of Queen Elinor, wife of King Henry III., A.D. 1236 (W. Y.), it is called a jewel of the king's treasury of great antiquity; and in that of King Henry VI., where it is called St. Edward's chalice, is added, which chalice by St. Edward's days was prized at thirty thousand marks, a prodigious sum in those days.†

* King Henry IV. was crowned with King Edward's crown, A.D. 1399.—Segar's *Honor*, lib. iii. cap. 45.

† We have no account of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, but on her proceeding to Parliament in the twenty-seventh year of her

Bradshaw, Windsor Herald, in his account of the coronation of King Charles I., amongst the ancient ornaments and ensigns of honour, mentions the robes and the sceptre of St. Edward, but nothing of the crown; but Kennet says he had the crown of King Edward the Confessor put on his head at his coronation.

The Church of Westminster had the custody of the royal regalia for the coronation of our kings by divers charters (from the Confessor) according to the Liber Regalis, whereby it was granted to be "Locus institutionis et Coronationis Regiæ et repositorium Regalium insignium in perpetuum," at which time it is supposed he gave to that church the regalia which was afterwards used at the coronation of our kings; and certain it is that, from the time of the Confessor, all our kings have been crowned at the Abbey of Westminster, except King Henry III., who in the Barons' Wars was crowned at Gloucester, and King Edward V., who was never crowned. The place where the regalia was kept (at least for a considerable time back) was in the arched room in the cloisters in an iron chest, where they were secured till the Grand Rebellion, when, A.D. 1642, Harry Martyn, by order of the then Parliament, broke open the chest and took out the crown called St. Edward's crown, and sold it, together with St. Edward's sceptre. Wherefore, after the Restoration, another crown and sceptre was made for the same purpose, and called St. Edward's, in commemoration of those which had been taken away. We may reasonably suppose this new crown was made after the fashion of the old one; and the fashion of it must have been well known to many persons of the Restoration, especially to Sir Edward

reign, she performed her devotions at Westminster Abbey, and received the golden sceptre of St. Edward, or, as expressed in another place, dedicated to St. Edward with great solemnity, and returned it again to the dean at the church door going out. (Milles' *Cat. Honour*, pp. 66, 67.) King James I. was invested with the robes, and crowned with the crown of King Edward the Confessor put on his head at his coronation.

Walker, Garter; and the fashion of the present crown of St. Edward differs not in the form from the imperial crown of state; and this being the case, that ancient crown before the Rebellion could not by the fashion of it be older than Edward IV.

As to the crown of St. Edward, with which Edward II. was crowned, it was probably as ancient as the Confessor, if not his; for he was so greatly esteemed for his sanctity before he was made a saint, that William the Conqueror adorned his sepulchre with a shrine. About a hundred years after this, A.D. 1163, he was canonised by Pope Alexander III., when Henry II. erected another more sumptuous shrine: afterwards King Henry III., having pulled down the old church and rebuilt it, erected a third shrine for him, and ever honoured him as his tutelar saint; and the chapel of this saint was made the burial-place of our kings till King Henry VII. erected the chapel that bears his name for that purpose. A superstitious regard seems all along to have been paid to this regalia, as the relics of the saint, and being in the custody of the church, could not be violated without double sacrilege. And not only the regalia, but the ceremonial of the coronation of our kings seems to be derived from this holy king, for before his time there does not seem to have been any determinate form. Of the fashion of this ancient crown we have no memorial, unless we may suppose it like that upon his great seal. What became of this old crown does not appear, but it must have disappeared long before the the time of Edward IV., because the crown made to supply the place of it about that time bore no resemblance to the ancient one, which it certainly would have done had the particular form been remembered. I can account for the loss of the crown no otherwise than as our kings frequently pawned their crowns, by that means it might be lost or destroyed. King Edward III. pawned his crown called Magna Corona Regis, and at another time Magna Corona Anglie, and perhaps one of these was the same called at coronations St. Edward's crown. We find it afterwards replaced by a

modern crown, without any account what became of the old one. So that the honour and virtue derived from the antiquity and identity of St. Edward's crown was lost, and it became merely nominal, in the same manner as the robes are still called St. Edward's, though perhaps none of our kings wore his individual robe.—(Vol. xi. pp. 357, 379, 399, 422.)

PRINCE CHARLES' ATTENDANTS IN SPAIN.

In a small 4to. MS. in my possession, entitled "A Narrative of Count Gondomar's Proceedings in England," is the following list of "The Prince's Servants" who accompanied him in his journey into Spain:

"*Master of the Horse*, Lord Andover.
Master of the Ward, Lord Compton.
Chamberlain, Lord Carey.
Comptroller, Lord Vaughan.
Secretary, Sir Francis Cottington.
Gentleman of the Bedchamber, Sir Robert Carr.
Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber: Sir William Howard, Sir Edmund Verney, Sir William Crofts, Sir Richard Wynne, Mr. Ralph Clare, Mr. John Sandilaus, Mr. Charles Glemham, Mr. Francis Carew.
Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber, Sir John North.
Gentlemen Ushers of the Presence: Mr. Newton, Mr. Young, Mr. Tyrwhitt.
Grooms of the Bedchamber, five.
Pages, three.
Chaplains, two."

EDWARD F. RIMBAULT.—(Vol. ix. p. 334.)

BIRTHPLACE OF EDWARD V.

"1471. In this year, the third day of November, Queen Elizabeth, being, as before is said, in Westminster Sanctuary, was lighted of a

fair prince. And within the said place the said child, without pomp' was after christened, whose godfathers were the abbat and prior of the said place, and the Lady Scrope godmother."—Fabian's *Chronicle*, p. 659, Lond. 1811.

MACKENZIE WALCOTT, M.A.—(Vol. viii. p. 601.)

LETTERS OF CHARLES I.

I have recently acquired a MS. quarto volume, consisting of copies of letters from King Charles I. to his Queen in the year 1646. They are sixty-four in number, and form a regular series from January 4 to December 26. They are written in a neat close hand (I believe) of the seventeenth century. I send you an exact transcript of the first letter. Twenty-four of them are dated at Oxford, and forty at New Castle.

J. C. WITTON.—(Vol. xii. p. 219.)

"Oxford, Jan. 4th, 1645–6.

"Dear Heart,

"I desired thee to take notice that with the year I begin to new number my letters, hoping to begin a year's course of good luck. I have heard of, but seen no letters from thee since Christmas day: the reason is evident, for our intelligence with the Portugal's agent is obstructed, so that I am not so confident as I was that any of my letters will come safe to thee. But methinks, if Card. Mazarin were but half so kind to us as he professes to be, it would be no great difficulty for him to secure our weekly intelligence. And in earnest I desire thee to put him to it; for, besides that if the effects of it succeed it will be of great consequence to me, I shall very much judge of the reality of his intentions according to his answer in this. If Ashburnham complain to thee of my wilfulness, I am sure it is that way, which at least thou wilt excuse, if not justify me in; but if thou hadst seen a former paper (to which being but accessary, I must not blame his judgment) thou wouldest have commended my cholerick rejection of it, the aversion to which it is possible (though I will not confess it until

thou sayest so) might have made me too nice in this, of which I will say no more, but consider well that which I sent in the place of it, and then judge.

"My great affairs are so much in expectation, that for the present I can give thee but little account of them, albeit yet in conjecture (as I believe) that the rebels will not admit of my personal treaty at London; and I hope well of having 2000 foot and horse out of my smaller garrisons. As for the Scots, we yet hear no news of them, neither concerning this treaty, nor of that which I have begun with David Lesley. And lastly, that the Duke of York's journey is absolutely broken both in respect of the loss of Hereford, as that the relief of Chester is yet but very doubtful. But upon this design, having commanded Sir George Ratcliff to wait upon him, I desire thy approbation that he may be sworn Gentleman of his Bedchamber; for which, though he be very fit, and I assure thee that he is far from being a Puritan, and that it will be much for my son's good to have him settled about him, yet I would not have him sworn without thy consent. So God bless thee, sweet heart, "CHARLES R.

"Even now, Montrevil is come hither concerning the treaty; the Queen cannot have a particular account of it till my next."

Note.—This valuable collection of Letters was subsequently published by the Camden Society, under the title of "Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria," edited by John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A.

EDWARD THE CONFESSOR'S RING.

The following is extracted from Taylor's *Glory of Regality*, pp. 74. *et seq.*

"The ring with which our kings are invested, called by some writers 'the wedding ring of England,' is illustrated, like the Ampulla, by a miraculous history, of which the following are the leading particulars, from the 'Golden

Legende' (*Julyan Notary*, 1503), p. 187. :—'Edward the Confessor being one day askt for alms by a certain fayre olde man,' the king found nothing to give him except his ring, with which the poor man thankfully departed. Some time after, two English pilgrims in the Holy Land having lost their road, as they travelled at the close of the day, 'there came to them a fayre auncyent man wyth whyte heer for age. Then the olde man axed them what they were and of what regyon. And they answerde that they were Pylgryms of Englond, and hadde lost their felyshyp and way also. Then this olde man comforted theym goodly, and brought theym into a fayre cytee; and whan they had well refresshyd them, and rested theym alle nyght; on the morne, this fayre olde man wente with theym and brought theym in the ryght waye agayne. And he was gladde to hear theym talke of the welfare and holynesse of theyr Kynge Saynt Edward. And whan he shold departe fro theym, thenne he told theym what he was, and sayd, I am Johan Theuangelyst, and saye ye unto Edward your king, that I grete hym well by the token that he gaaf to me thys rynge with his one hondes, whych rynge ye shalle delyuer to hym agayne: and whan he had delyuerde to theym the ringe, he departed from theym sodenly.'

"This command, as may be supposed, was punctually obeyed by the messengers, who were furnisht with ample powers for authenticating their mission. The ring was received by the Royal Confessor, and in after times was preserved with due care at his shrine in the Abbey of Westminster."—(Vol. vii. p. 15.)

QUEEN ELIZABETH.

The following description of Queen Elizabeth is from "Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth," by Sir John Hayward, Knight, D.C.L., p. 449.

"Shee was a lady upon whom nature had bestowed, and well placed, many of her fayrest favors; of stature meane, slender, streight, and amiably composed; of such state in her

carriage, as every motion of her seemed to beare majesty; her haire was inclined to pale yellow, her foreheade large and faire, and seemeing seat for princely grace; her eyes lively and sweete, but short-sighted; her nose somewhat rising in the middest. The whole compasse of her countenance somewhat long, but yet of admirable beauty; not so much in that which is termed the flower of youth, as in a most delightfull compositione of majesty and modesty in equall mixture . . . . Her vertues were such as might suffice to make an Æthiopian beautifull; which, the more man knows and understands, the more he shall love and admire. In life, shee was most innocent; in desires, moderate; in purpose, just; of spirit, above credit and almost capacity of her sexe: of divine witt, as well for depth of judgment, as for quick conceite and speedy expeditione; of eloquence, as sweet in the utterance, soe ready and easy to come to the utterance; of wonderful knowledge, both in learning and affayres; skilfull not only in Latine and Greeke, but alsoe in divers foraigne languages. None knew better the hardest art of all others, that of commanding men; nor could more use themselves to those cares, without which the royall dignity could not be supported. Shee was relligeous, magnanimous, mercifull and just."

Hayward wrote the commencement of a *Life of Henry IV.*, dedicated to the Earl of Essex; a seditious pamphlet, "as it was termed," says Lord Bacon, for which he was committed to prison, the queen being anxious to subject him to very severe treatment.

R. J. Shaw.—(Vol. x. p. 52.)

CHARLES II. IN WALES.

There is a tradition amongst the inhabitants of Glamorganshire, that, after his defeat at the battle of Worcester, Charles came to Wales and staid a night at a place called Llancaiach Vawr, in the parish of Gelligaer. The place then belonged a Colonel Pritchard, an officer in the Parlia-

mentary army; and the story relates that he made himself known to his host, and threw himself upon his generosity for safety. The colonel assented to his staying for *one* night only, but went away himself, afraid, as the story goes, that the Parliament should come to know he had succoured Charles. I know that Llancaiach was a place of considerable note long after that, and that an old farmer used to say he had heard the story from his father. The historians, I believe, are all silent as to his having fled to Wales between the time of his defeat at Worcester and the time he left the country. DAVYDD GAM.—(Vol. iii. p. 263.)

In reply to this note, J. M. T., vol. iii. p. 379, writes as follows:—

I have never heard of the tradition in question, nor have I met with any evidence to show that Charles II. was in any part of Wales at this period. In "The true Narrative and Relation of his most sacred Majesty's Escape from Worcester," *Selection from the Harleian Miscellany*, 4to., p. 380., it is stated that the king meditated the scheme of crossing into Wales from White Ladies, the house of the Penderells, but that "the design was crossed." One of the "Boscobel Tracts," at p. 137., treating of the same period, and compiled by the king himself in 1680, mentions his intention of making his escape another way, which was to get over the Severn into Wales, and so get either to Swansea, or some other of the sea towns he knew that had commerce with France; besides that he "remembered several honest gentlemen" that were of his acquaintance. However, the scheme was abandoned, and the king fled to the southward by Madeley, Boscobel, &c., to Cirencester, Bristol, and into Dorsetshire and thence to Brighton, where he embarked for France on the 15th Oct., 1651.

Llancaiach is still in possession of the Prichard family, descendants of Col. Prichard.

There is a tradition that Charles I. slept there on his way from Cardiff Castle to Brecon, in 1645, and the tester of the bed in which his Majesty slept is stated to have been in the

possession of a Cardiff antiquary now deceased. The facts of the case appear in the *Iter Carolinum*, printed by Peck (*Desiderata Curiosa*). The king stayed at Cardiff from the 29th July to the 5th August, 1645, on which day he dined at Llancaiach, and supped at Brecon.

BATTLE OF VILLERS EN COUCHÉ.

The Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson writes as follows:—

We have, as an heir-loom in our family, a medal worn by an officer on the occasion of the battle of Villers en Couché: it is suspended from a red and white ribbon, and is inscribed thus;

"FORTITUDINE
VILLERS EN COUCHÉ.
24TH APRIL,
1794."

I do not remember to have read any account of the battle; but as I have heard from the lips of one who gained his information from the officer before alluded to, the particulars were these:—General Mansell, with a force consisting of two squadrons of the 15th Hussars, and one squadron of the German Legion, *two hundred and seventy-two* in all, charged a body of the French army, *ten thousand* strong. The French were formed in a hollow square: five times did our gallant troops charge into and out of the square, till the French, struck with a sudden panic, retreated with a loss of twelve hundred men.—(Vol. viii. p. 8.)

This communication led to the following.

I possess a singular work, consisting of a series of *Poetical Sketches* of the campaigns of 1793 and 1794, written, as the title-page asserts, by an "officer of the Guards;" who appears to have been, from what he subsequently states, on the personal staff of His Royal Highness the late Duke of York. This work, I have been given to understand, was suppressed shortly after its publication; the ludicrous

light thrown by its pages on the conduct of many of the chief parties engaged in the transactions it records, being no doubt unpalatable to those high in authority. From the notes, which are valuable as appearing to emanate from an eye-witness, and sometimes an actor in the scenes he describes, I send the following extracts; premising that the letter to which they are appended is dated from the "Camp at Inchin, April 26, 1794:"—

"As the enemy were known to have assembled in great force at the Camp de César, near Cambray, Prince Cobourg requested the Duke of York would make a *reconnoissance* in that direction: accordingly, on the evening of the 23rd, Major-General Mansel's brigade of heavy cavalry was ordered about a league in front of their camp, where they lay that night at a farm-house, forming *part* of a detachment under General Otto. Early the next morning an attack was made on the French drawn up in front of the village of Villers en Couché (between Le Cateau and Bouchain) by the 15th regiment of Light Dragoons, and two squadrons of Austrian Hussars: they charged the enemy with such velocity and force, that, darting through their cavalry, they dispersed a line of infantry formed in their rear, forcing them also to retreat precipitately and in great confusion, under cover of the ramparts of Cambray; with a loss of 1200 men, and three pieces of cannon. The only British officer wounded was Captain Aylett: sixty privates fell, and about twenty were wounded.

"Though the heavy brigade was formed at a distance under a brisk cannonade, while the light dragoons had so glorious an opportunity of distinguishing themselves, there are none who can attach with propriety any blame on account of their unfortunate delay; for which General Otto was surely, as having the command, alone accountable, and not General Mansel, who acted at all times, there is no doubt, according to the best of his judgment for the good of the service.

"The Duke of York had, on the morning of the 26th, observed the left flank of the enemy to be unprotected; and, by ordering the cavalry to wheel round and attack on that side, afforded them an opportunity of gaining the highest credit by defeating the French army, so much superior to them in point of numbers.

"General Mansel rushing into the thickest of the enemy devoted himself to death; and animated by his example, that *very* brigade performed such prodigies of valour, as must have convinced the world that Britons, once informed *how to act*, justify the highest

opinion that can possibly be entertained of their native courage. Could such men have *ever* been willingly *backward?* Certainly not.

"General Mansel's son, a captain in the 3rd Dragoon Guards, anxious to save his father's life, had darted forwards, and was taken prisoner, and carried into Cambray. Since his exchange, he has declared that there was not, on the 26th, *a single French soldier* left in the town, as Chapuy had drawn out the whole garrison to augment the army destined to attack the camp of Inchin. Had that circumstance been fortunately known at the time, a detachment of the British army might easily have marched along the Chaussée, and taken possession of the place ere the Republicans could possibly have returned, as they had in their retreat described a circuitous detour of some miles."

Mr. Simpson will perceive, from the above extracts, that the brilliant skirmish of Villers en Couché took place on April 24th; whereas the defeat of the French army under Chapuy did not occur until two days later. A large quantity of ammunition and thirty-five pieces of cannon were then captured; and although the writer does not mention the number who were killed on the part of the enemy, yet, as he states that Chapuy and near 400 of his men were made prisoners, their loss by death was no doubt proportionately large.

The 15th Hussars have long borne on their colours the memorable words "Villers en Couché" to commemorate the daring valour they displayed on that occasion.

T. C. Smith.—(Vol. viii. p. 127.)

In Cruttwell's *Universal Gazetteer* (1808) this village, which is five miles north-east of Cambray, is described as being "remarkable for an action between the French and the Allies on the 24th of April, 1794." The following officers of the 15th regiment of light dragoons are there named as having afterwards received crosses of the Order of Maria Theresa for their gallant behaviour, from the Emperor of Germany, viz.:—

"Major W. Aylett, Capt. Robert Pocklington, Capt. Edw. Michael Ryan, Lieut. Thos. Granby Calcraft, Lieut. Wm. Keir, Lieut. Chas. Burrel Blount, Cornet Edward Gerald Butler, and Cornet Robert Thos. Wilson."

D. S.—(Vol. viii. p. 128.)

An authoritative record of this action may be found in—

"An Historical Journal of the British Campaign on the Continent, in the year 1794; with the Retreat through Holland, in the year 1795. By Captain L. T. Jones, of the 14th regiment. Dedicated, by permission, to his Royal Highness Field Marshal the Duke of York. Printed for the Author. Birmingham, 1797."

The list of subscribers contains about a hundred names. There is a copy of it in the British Museum. The one now before me is rendered more valuable by copious marginal notes, evidently written by the author, which furnish the following extraordinary instance of personal bravery:—

"The same officer of this corps (3rd dragoon guards), who bore off the corpse of General Mansel, relates some particulars in the action of the 24th, under General Otto:—that a man of the name of Barnes, who had been unfortunately reduced from a sergeant to the ranks, had bravely advanced, doing execution on the enemy, till his retreat was foreclosed, and he was seen engaged with five French dragoons at once; all of these he fairly cut down, when nine more came upon him, whom he faced and fairly kept at bay, till one of them got behind him, and shot the brave fellow in the head."

In reference to the action of the 26th, Captain Jones observes:—

"It is not possible to describe the bravery of the army on that day: nearly the whole of the British cavalry were engaged, and gained immortal honour."

The Duke of York's address to the army, published on the 28th of April, thus concludes:—

"His Royal Highness has, at all times, had the highest confidence in the courage of the British troops in general, and he trusts that the cavalry will now be convinced that whenever they attack with the firmness, velocity, and order which they showed on this occasion, no number of the enemy (we have to deal with) can resist them."

BIBLIOTHECAR. CHETHAM.—(Vol. viii. p. 205.)

I am in a position to furnish a more complete account of this skirmish, and of the action of April 26, in which my grandfather, General Mansel, fell, from a copy of the *Evening Mail* of May 14th, 1794, now in the possession of J. C. Mansel, Esq., of Cosgrove Hall, Northamptonshire.

Your correspondent Mr. T. C. Smith appears to have been misinformed as to the immediate suppression of the *Poetical Sketches* by an officer of the Guards, as I have seen the *third edition* of that work, printed in 1796.

"*Particulars of the Glorious Victory obtained by the English Cavalry over the French under the Command of General Chapuis, at Troisoille, on the 26th of April*, 1794.

"On the 25th, according to orders received from the Committee of Public Safety, and subsequently from General Pichegru, General Chapuis, who commanded the Camp of Cæsar, marched from thence with his whole force, consisting of 25,000 infantry, 3000 cavalry, and seventy-five pieces of cannon. At Cambray he divided them into three columns; the one marched by Ligny, and attacked the redoubt at Troisoille, which was most gallantly defended by Col. Congreve against this column of 10,000 men. The second column was then united, consisting of 12,000 men, which marched on the high road as far as Beausois, and from that village turned off to join the first column; and the attack recommenced against Col. Congreve's redoubt, who kept the whole at bay. The enemy's flank was supported by the village of Caudry, to defend which they had six pieces of cannon, 2000 infantry, and 500 cavalry. During this period Gen. Otto conceived it practicable to fall on their flank with the cavalry; in consequence of which, General Mansel, with about 1450 men — consisting of the Blues, 1st and 3rd Dragoon Guards, 5th Dragoon Guards, and 1st Dragoons, 15th and 16th Dragoons, with Gen. Dundas, and a division of Austrian cuirassiers, and another of Archduke Ferdinand's hussars under Prince Swartzenburg — after several manœuvres, came up with the enemy in the village of Caudry, through which they charged, putting the cavalry to flight, and putting a number of infantry to the sword, and taking the cannon. Gen. Chapuis, perceiving the attack on the village of Caudry, sent down the regiment of carabineers to support those troops; but the succour came too late, and this regiment was charged by the English light dragoons and the hussars, and immediately gave way with some little loss. The charge was then continued against a battery of eight pieces of cannon behind a small ravine, which was soon carried; and, with equal rapidity, the heavy cavalry rushed on to attack a battery of fourteen pieces of cannon, placed on an eminence behind a very steep ravine, into which many of the front ranks fell; and the cannon, being loaded with grape, did some execution: however, a considerable body, with General Mansel at their head, passed the ravine, and charged the cannon with inconceivable intrepidity, and their efforts were crowned with the utmost success. This event decided

the day, and the remaining time was passed in cutting down battalions, till every man and horse was obliged to give up the pursuit from fatigue. It was at the mouth of this battery that the brave and worthy Gen. Mansel was shot: one grape-shot entering his chin, fracturing the spine, and coming out between the shoulders, and the other breaking his arm to splinters; his horse was also killed under him, his Brigade Major Payne's horse shot, and his son and aide-de-camp, Capt. Mansel, wounded and taken prisoner; and it is since known that he was taken into Arras. The French lost between 14,000 and 15,000 men killed; we took 580 prisoners. The loss in tumbrils and ammunition was immense, and in all fifty pieces of cannon, of which thirty-five fell to the English; twenty-seven to the heavy, and eight to the light cavalry. Thus ended a day which will redound with immortal honour to the bravery of the British cavalry, who, assisted by a small body of Austrians, the whole not amounting to 1500, gained so complete a victory over 22,000 men in sight of their *corps de reserve*, consisting of 6000 men and twenty pieces of cannon. Had the cavalry been more numerous, or the infantry able to come up, it is probable few of the French would have escaped. History does not furnish such an example of courage.

"The whole army lamented the loss of the brave General, who thus gloriously terminated a long military career, during which he had been ever honoured, esteemed, and respected by all who knew him. It should be some consolation to those he has left behind him, that his reputation was as unsullied as his soul was honest; and that he died as he lived, an example of true courage, honour, and humility. On the 24th General Mansel narrowly escaped being surrounded at Villers en Couché by the enemy, owing to a mistake of General Otto's aide-de-camp, who was sent to bring up the heavy cavalry: in doing which he mistook the way, and led them to the front of the enemy's cannon, by which the 3rd Dragoon Guards suffered considerably."—Extract from the *Evening Mail*, May 14, 1794.

From the above extract, compared with the communication of Mr. Smith, it appears that the 15th Light Dragoons were engaged in both actions, that of Villers en Couché on April 24, and that of Troisoille (or Cateau) on the 26th.

H. L. Mansel, B.D.—(Vol. viii. p. 370.)

In the *Journals and Correspondence of Sir Harry Calvert*, edited by Sir Harry Verney, under the date of the 25th of April, 1794, Sir Harry Calvert thus describes the action at Villers en Couché:

"Since Tuesday, as I foresaw was likely, we have been a good deal on the *qui vive*. On Wednesday morning we had information that the enemy had moved in considerable force from the Camp de César, and early in the afternoon we learned that they had crossed the Selle at Saultzoir, and pushed patrols towards Quesnoy and Valenciennes. The Duke [of York] sent orders to General Otto, who had gone out to Cambray on a reconnoitring party with light dragoons and hussars, to get into the rear of the enemy, find out their strength, and endeavour to cut them off. The enemy retired to Villers en Couché that night, but occupied Saultzoir and Haussy. Otto, finding their strength greater than he expected, about 14,000, early in the evening sent in for a brigade of heavy cavalry for his support, which marched first to Fontaine Antarque, and afterwards to St. Hilaire; and in the night he sent for a farther support of four battalions and some artillery. Unfortunately he confided this important mission to a hussar, who never delivered it, probably having lost his way, so that, in the morning, the general found himself under the necessity of attacking with very inferior numbers. However, by repeated charges of his light cavalry, he drove the enemy back into their camp, and took three pieces of cannon. He had, at one time, taken eight; but the enemy, bringing up repeated reinforcements of fresh troops, retook five.

"Our loss I cannot yet ascertain, but I fear the 15th Light Dragoons have suffered considerably. Two battalions of the enemy are entirely destroyed."

The especial bravery of the troops engaged on the 26th prompted the following entry in his journal by Sir Harry Calvert:—

"April 26.—The enemy made a general attack on the camp of the allies. On their approaching the right of the camp, the Duke of York directed a column of heavy cavalry, consisting of the regiment of Zedwitsch Cuirassiers, the Blues, Royals, 1st, 3rd, and 5th Dragoon Guards, to turn the enemy, or endeavour to take them in flank, which service they performed in a style beyond all praise, charging repeatedly through the enemy's column, and taking twenty-six pieces of cannon. The light dragoons and hussars took nine pieces on the left of the Duke's camp."

Sir Harry Verney has printed in an Appendix his father's well-considered plans for the defence of the country against the invasion anticipated in 1796.

J. B.—(Vol. viii. p. 37.)

ORIGINAL LETTER FROM SIR BEVIL GRENVILE.

The following is a copy of an original Letter from Sir Bevil Grenvile to his wife, giving an account of the Battle of Bradock Down near Liskeard, in which the Parliamentary Forces under Ruthen were defeated, 19th of January, 1642. See *Clarendon*, Book VI.

T. E. D.—(Vol. x. p. 417.)

My deare Love,

It has pleas'd God to give us a happie victory this present Thursday being y^e^ 19^th^ of Jany., for which pray join w^th^ me in giving God thanks. We advanced yesterday from Bodmin to find y^e^ enemy w^ch^ we heard was abroad, or if we miss'd him in the field we were resolved to unhouse them in Liskeard or leave our boddies in the highway. We were not above 3 miles from Bodmin, when we had view of two troops of their horse to whom we sent some of ours w^ch^ chased them out of the field while our foot march'd after our horse; but night coming on we could march no farther then Boconnocke Parke, where (upon my co. Mohum's kind motion) we quartered all our army by good fires under the hedge. The next morning (being this day) we march'd forth, and ab^t^ noone came in full view of the enemies whole army upon a fair heath between Boconnocke and Braddock Church. They were in horse much stronger than we, but in foot we were superior, as I thinke. They were possest of a pretty rising ground which was in the way towards Liskeard, and we planted ourselves upon such another against them w^th^in muskett shot, and we saluted each other with bulletts about two hours or more, each side being willing to keep their ground and to have the other to come over to his prejudice; but after so long delay, they standing still firm, and being obstinate to hould their advantage, Sir Ra' Hopton resolved to march over to them, and to leave all to the mercy of God and valour of our side. I had the van; so after solemne prayers in the head of every division, I led

my part away, who followed me w^th^ so good courage both down one hill and up the other, as it strooke a terror in them, while the seconds came up gallantly after me, and the wings of horse charged on both sides, but their courage so fail'd them as they stood not our first charge of the foot, but fled in great disorder, and we chast them diverse miles; many were not slain because of their quick disordering, but we have taken above 600 prisoners, amongst which S^r^ Shilston Calmady is one, and more are still brought in by the soldiers; much armes they have lost, and colours we have won, and 4 pieces of ordnance from them, and without rest we marched to Liskeard, and tooke it w^thout delay, all their men flying f^m^ it before we came, and so I hope we are now again in y^e^ way to settle the country in peace. All our Cornish Grandies were present at the battell w^th^ the Scotch Generall Ruthen, the Somersett Collonels, and the horse Captains Pim and Tomson, and but for their horses' speed had been all in our hands; let my Sister and my Cossens of Clovelly, w^th^ y^e^ other friends, understand of God's mercy to us, and we lost not a man. So I rest

Y^rs^ ever,

Liskeard, Jan. 19. 1642. BEVIL GRENVILE.

For the Lady Grace Grenvile,
at Stow, d. d.

The messenger is paide, yet give him a shilling more.

LETTER OF LORD NELSON.

I have in my possession a long letter written by Lord Nelson, sixteen days before the battle of Trafalgar, to the Right Hon. Lord Barham, who was at that time First Lord of the Admiralty. It has not yet, as far as I am aware, been published.

EUSTACE W. JACOB. — (Vol. ix. p. 241.)

Victory, Oct. 5th, 1805.

My dear Lord,

On Monday the French and Spanish ships took their

troops on board which had been landed on their arrival, and it is said that they mean to sail the first fresh Levant wind. And as the Carthagena ships are ready, and, when seen a few days ago, had their topsail yards hoisted up, this looks like a junction. The position I have taken for this month, is from sixteen to eighteen leagues west of Cadiz; for, although it is most desirable that the fleet should be well up in the easterly winds, yet I must guard against being caught with a westerly wind near Cadiz: for a fleet of ships, with so many three-deckers, would inevitably be forced into the Straits, and then Cadiz would be perfectly free for them to come out with a westerly wind—as they served Lord Keith in the late war. I am most anxious for the arrival of frigates: less than eight, with the brigs, &c., as we settled, I find are absolutely inadequate for this service and to be with the fleet; and Spartel, Cape Cantin, or Blanco, and the Salvages, must be watched by fast-sailing vessels, in case any squadron should escape.

I have been obliged to send six sail of the line to water and get stores, &c. at Tetuan and Gibraltar; for if I did not begin, I should very soon be obliged to take the whole fleet into the Straits. I have twenty-three sail with me, and should they come out, I shall immediately bring them to battle; but although I should not doubt of spoiling any voyage they may attempt, yet I hope for the arrival of the ships from England, that, as an enemy's fleet, they may be annihilated. Your Lordship may rely upon every exertion from

Your very faithful and obedient servant,

NELSON AND BRONTE.

I find the Guerrier is reduced to the command of a Lieutenant; I hope your Lordship will allow me to seek Sir William Bolton, and to place him in the first vacant frigate; he will be acting in a ship when the Captains go home with Sir Robert Calder. This will much oblige *me*.

SCOTCH PRISONERS AT WORCESTER.

In Mr. Walcott's *History of St. Margaret's Church, Westminster*, I find the following extract from the churchwardens' accounts :—

"1652. P^d^ to Thos. Wright for 67 loads of soyle laid on the graves in Tothill Fields, wherein 1200 Scotch prisoners, taken at the fight at Worcester, were buried ; and for other pains taken with his teeme of horses, about mending the Sanctuary Highway, when Gen. Ireton was buried - - - - - - xxx^s^."

I have taken the pains to verify this extract, and find the figures quite correctly given. Is this abominable massacre in cold blood mentioned by any of our historians ? But for such unexceptionable evidence, it would appear incredible. C. F. S.—(Vol. ii. p. 297.)

This Note elicited the following communications on the same subject : —

I cannot think that the extract from the accounts of the churchwardens of St. Margaret's Westminster, at all justifies C. F. S. in supposing that the Scotch prisoners were massacred in cold blood. The total number of these prisoners was 10,000. Of the 1200 who were buried, the greater part most probably died of their wounds ; and though this number is large, yet we must bear in mind that in those days the sick and wounded were not tended with the care and attention which are now displayed in such cases. We learn from the *Parliamentary History* (xx. 58.), that on the 17th Sept. 1651, "the Scots prisoners were brought to London, and marched through the city into Tothill-fields." The same work (xx. 72.) states that "Most of the common soldiers were sent to the English Plantations ; and 1500 of them were granted to the Guiney merchants and sent to work in the Gold mines there." Large numbers were also employed in draining the great level of the Fens (Wells, *History of the Bedford Level*, i. 228—244.). Lord Clarendon (book xiii.) says, "Many perished for want of food, and, being enclosed in little

room till they were sold to the plantations for slaves, they died of all diseases."

C. H. Cooper. — (Vol. ii. p. 380.)

The following is Rapin's account of the disposition of these prisoners, and even this statement he seems to doubt. (Vol. ii. p. 585.)

"It is pretended, of the Scots were slain [at Worcester] about 2000, and seven or eight thousand taken prisoners, who, being sent to London, were sold for slaves to the plantations of the American isles."—Authorities referred to: Phillips, p. 608., Clarendon, iii. p. 320., Burnet's *Mem.* p. 432.

J. C. B.—(Vol. ii. p. 350.)

Heath's *Chronicle* (p. 301. edit. 1676) briefly notices these unhappy men, "driven like a herd of swine, through Westminster to Tuthill Fields, and there *sold* to several merchants, and sent in to the Barbadoes."

The most graphic account, however, is given in *Another Victory in Lancashire*, &c., 4to. 1651, from which the parts possessing *local* interest were extracted by me in the *Civil War Tracts of Lancashire*, printed by the Chetham Society, with references to the *other matters* noticed, namely, Cromwell's entry into London, and the arrival of the four thousand "*Scots, Highlands, or Redshanks.*"

These lay on Hampstead Heath, and were thence guarded through Highgate, and behind Islington to Kingsland and Mile End Green, receiving charity as they went, and having "a cart load or two of biskett behind them." Thence they proceeded by Aldgate, through Cheapside, Fleet-street, and the Strand, and on through Westminster.

"Many of them brought their wives and berns in with them, yet were many of our scotified citizens so pitifull unto them, that as they passed through the city, they made them, though prisoners at mercy, masters of more money and good white bread than some of them ever see in their lives. They marched this night [Saturday, Sept. 13.] into Tuttle Fields. Some Irishmen are among them, but most of them are habited after that fashion."

The contemporary journals in the British Museum would

probably state some epidemic which may have caused the mortality that followed. Geo. Ormerod.—(Vol. ii. p. 379.)

"The judgements of heaven were never so visible upon any people as those which have fallen upon the Scots since [the sale of Charles I.]; for, besides the sweeping furious plague that reigned in Edinburgh, and the incredible number of witches which have increased, and have been executed there since; besides the sundry shameful defeats they have received by the English, who carried away more of them prisoners than they were themselves in number; *besides that many of them died of mere hunger; besides that they were sold away slaves, at half a crown a dozen, for foreign plantations among savages;* I say besides all this chain of judgements, with diverse others, they have quite lost their reputation among all mankind; some jeer them, some hate them, and none pity them."—Howell's *German Dict.*, p. 65, 1653.

Echard, in *Hist. Eng.*, vol. ii. p. 727., speaking of the prisoners taken at Worcester, says that Cromwell

"marched up triumphantly to London, driving four or five thousand prisoners like sheep before him; making presents of them, as occasion offered, as of so many slaves, and selling the rest for that purpose into the English plantations abroad."

W. Dn.—(Vol. ii. p. 445.)

The battle of Worcester was fought Sept. 3, 1651. On the same day, in the preceding year, the battle of Dunbar was fought, in which Cromwell slew 3,000 and took prisoners 9,000 Scots. The disposal of a part of the latter (and from which we may infer the kind of slavery to which the Worcester prisoners were afterwards subjected) is thus described in a "letter from Mr. John Cotton to Lord General Cromwell," dated "Boston, in N. E., 28 of 5th, 1651:"—

"The Scots, whom God delivered into your hands at Dunbarre, and whereof sundry were sent hither, we have been desirous (as we could) to make their yoke easy. Such as were sick of the scurvy or other diseases have not wanted physick and chyrurgery. They have not been sold for slaves to perpetuall servitude, but for six, or seven, or eight years, as we do our owne; and he that bought the most of them (I heare) buildeth houses for them, for every four a house, layeth some acres of ground thereto, which he giveth them as their owne, requiring three days in the weeke to worke for him (by turns), and four dayes for themselves, and promiseth, as soone as they

can repay him the money he layed out for them, he will set them at liberty."

In Cromwell's answer to this letter, dated "Oct. 2nd, 1651," he thus alludes to the battle of Worcester, fought in the preceding month : —

"The Lord hath marvelously appeared even against them; and now again when all the power was devolved into the Scottish Kinge and the malignant partie, they invaded England, the Lord has rayned upon them such snares as the enclosed will show, only the narrative is short in this, that of their whole armie, when the narrative was framed, not five of their whole armie were returned."

Both letters will be found in Governor Hutchinson's *Collection of Original Papers* relative to the History of Massachusets Bay, Boston, 1769, pp. 235-6. It is singular that Hume (chap. ix) does not notice the sale into slavery of the prisoners taken either at Dunbar or Worcester. Southey, in his *Book of the Church* (chap. xvii., p. 475., London, 1841), says :—

After the battle of Worcester many of the prisoners were actually shipt for *Barbadoes* and sold there."

ERIC.—(Vol. ii. p. 454.)

RICHARD III.

After the battle of Bosworth Field, the body of Richard III. was stript, laid across a horse behind a pursuivant-at-arms, and conducted to Leicester, where after it had been exposed for two days, it was buried with little ceremony in the church of the Grey Friars. In Burton's MS. of the History of Leicester, we read that, "within the town was a house of Franciscan or Grey Friars, built by Simon Montfort, Earl of Leicester, whither (after Bosworth Field) the dead body of Richard III., naked, trussed behind a pursuivant-at-arms, all dashed with mire and blood, was there brought and homely buried; where afterward King Henry VII. (out of a royal disposition) erected for him a fair alabaster monument, with his picture cut out, and

made thereon."—Nichols's *Leicestershire*, vol. i. p. 357.: see also pp. 298. 381.

PRINCESSES OF WALES.

Blackstone, in his *Commentaries*, vol. i. p. 224., says, the heir apparent to the crown is usually made Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester; upon which Mr. Christian in a note remarks, upon the authority of Hume, that this creation has not been confined to the heir apparent, for both Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth were created by their father, Henry VIII., Princesses of Wales, each of them at the time (the latter after the legitimation of Mary) being heir presumptive to the crown.

Can any of your correspondents inform me upon what authority this statement of Hume rests? or whether there exists any evidence of such creations having been made? Do any such creations appear upon the Patent Rolls? The statement is not supported by any writer of authority upon such subjects, and, as far as your Querist's investigation has proceeded, seems without foundation. It is one, however, too important in connection with royal titles to remain uncontradicted, if the fact be not so.

G.—(Vol. iii. p. 477.)

These queries produced the following reply:—

The statement of Hume, that Elizabeth and Mary were created Princesses of Wales, rests, I am disposed to think, on most insufficient authority; and I am surprised that so illustrious an author should have made an assertion on such slender grounds, which carries on the face of it a manifest absurdity, and which was afterwards retracted by the very author from whom he borrowed it.

Hume's authority is evidently Burnet's *History of the Reformation;* (indeed, in some editions Burnet is referred to) in which are the following passages (vol. i. p. 71., Oxford edition, 1829):—

"The king, being out of hopes of more children, declared his

daughter (Mary) Princess of Wales, and sent her to Ludlow to hold her court there, and projected divers matches for her."

Again, p. 271.:—

"Elizabeth was soon after declared Princess of Wales; though lawyers thought that against law, for she was only heir presumptive, but not apparent, to the crown, since a son coming after he must be preferred. Yet the king would justify what he had done in his marriage with all possible respect; and having before declared the Lady Mary Princess of Wales, he did now the same in favour of the Lady Elizabeth."

Hume's statement is taken almost verbatim from this last passage of Burnet, who, however, it will be observed, does not say "created," but "declared" Princess of Wales; the distinction between which is obvious. He was evidently not aware that Burnet afterwards corrected this statement in an Appendix, entitled, "Some Mistakes in the first Portion of this History communicated to me by Mr. William Fulman, Rector of Hampton Meysey, in Gloucestershire." In this is the following note, in correction of the passages I have quoted (Burn. *Hist. Ref.*, vol. iv. p. 578.):—

"Here and in several other places it is supposed that the next heir apparent of the crown was Prince of Wales. The heir apparent of the crown is indeed prince, but not, strictly speaking, of Wales, unless he has it given him by creation; and it is said that there is nothing on record to prove that any of Henry's children were ever created Prince of Wales. There are indeed some hints of the Lady Mary's being styled Princess of Wales; for when a family was appointed for her, 1525, Veysey, bishop of Exeter, her tutor, was made president of Wales. She also is said to have kept her house at Ludlow; and Leland says, that Tekenhill, a house in those parts, built for Prince Arthur, was prepared for her. And Thomas Linacre dedicates his *Rudiments of Grammar* to her, by the title of Princess of Cornwall and Wales."

This is one of the many instances of the inaccuracy, carelessness, and (where his religious or political prejudices were not concerned) credulity of Burnet. Whatever he found written in any previous historian, unless it militated against his preconceived opinions, he received as true, without considering whether the writer was entitled to credit,

and had good means of gaining information. Now, neither Hall, Holinshed, Polydore Virgil, nor (I think) Cardinal Pole, contemporary writers, say anything about Mary or Elizabeth being Princesses of Wales. The only writer I am acquainted with who does say any such thing, previous to Burnet, and whose authority I am therefore compelled to suppose the latter relied on, when he made the statement which he afterwards contradicted, is Pollini, an obscure Italian Dominican, who wrote a work entitled *L'Historia Ecclesiastica della Rivoluzion d'Inghilterra; Racolta da Gravissimi Scrittori non meno di quella Nazione, che dell' altri, da F. Girolamo Pollini dell' ordine de Predicatori, della Provincia de Toscana:* Roma, Facciotti, 1594. In book i. chapter ii. page 7. of this author is the following statement which I translate, speaking of the Princess Mary: —

"As the rightful heir of the throne she was declared by Henry, her father, Princess of Wales, which is the ordinary title borne by the first-born of the king; since the administration and government of this province is allowed to no other, except to that son or daughter of the king, to whom, by hereditary right, on the death of the king the government of the realm falls. . . . In the same way that the first-born of the French king is called the Dauphin, so the first-born of the English king is called Prince of Britain, or of Wales, which is a province of that large island, lying to the west, and containing four bishoprics. Which Mary, with the dignity and title of Princess, assisted by a most illustrious senate, and accompanied by a splendid establishment, administered with much prudence," &c.

Pollini's history is, as may be supposed, of very little historical value; and one feels surprised that, on a point like the present, Burnet should have allowed himself to be misled by him. But still more remarkable, in my opinion, is the use Miss Strickland makes of this author. After several times giving him as her authority at the foot of the page, by the name of *Pollino*, but without giving the least information as to the name of his work, or who he was, she has the following note relating to the passage I have quoted (*Lives of the Queens of England*, vol. v. p. 156.):—

"The Italian then carefully explains that the Princes of Wales were in the same position, in regard to the English crown, as the Dauphins were to that of France. Pollino must have had good documentary evidence, since he describes Mary's council and court, which he calls a senate, exactly as if the Privy Council books had been open to him. *He says four bishops were attached to this court.*"

It seems to me a singular mode of proving that Pollini must have had good documentary evidence, by saying that he speaks exactly and positively; and I would ask what *good* documentary evidence would a Florentine friar be likely to have, who certainly never was in England, and in all probability never far from his convent? But it is the statement about the bishops that I wish more particularly to allude to, as I can find *no statement to that effect in Pollini*, and can only suppose that Miss Strickland misunderstood the passage (quoted above) where he says the province of Wales contains four bishoprics.

I think I have now shown that Hume's statement rests on no sufficient grounds as to the authority from whence he derived it. But there is yet another against it, which is this: it would be necessary, before Elizabeth was created Princess of Wales, that Mary should be deprived of it; and this could only be done by a special act of parliament. But we find no act of such a nature passed in the reign of Henry VIII. There are other reasons also against it; but having, I think, said enough to show the want of any foundation for the assertion, I shall not trouble you any further. C. C. R.—(Vol. iv. p. 24.)

THE EMPRESS HELENA.

Most readers of general history are aware that the parentage of the renowned mother of the still more renowned Constantine has been claimed for two widely different sources,—a British king on the one hand, and an innkeeper of Bithynia on the other. In favour of the former, we have Geoffrey of Monmouth, Carte the English historian, and modern Welsh authors; for the latter, Gibbon and his authorities. The

object of the present Query is threefold: 1. Will some one having access to Geoffrey be kind enough to favour me (in the original or a translation) with the exact statement of the chronicler to which Gibbon refers? 2. Are writers of intelligence and credit quite agreed that the tradition which assigns to the wife of Constantius a royal British parentage was "invented in the darkness of monasteries?" 3. Where is the question—one of interest in many ways—fully and satisfactorily discussed? H.—(Vol. iv. p. 154.)

The statement will be found in Geoffrey's *British History*, book v. ch. 6.:—"After the decease of Coel, a petty prince of Caercolvin [Colchester], Constantius himself was crowned, and married the daughter of Coel, whose name was Helena. She surpassed all the ladies of the country in beauty, as she did all others of the time in her skill in music and the liberal arts. Her father had no other issue to succeed him on the throne; for which reason he was very careful about her education, that she might be better qualified to govern the kingdom. Constantius, therefore, having made her partner of his bed, had a son by her called Constantine." Thus far Geoffrey; and with him agree Baronius, Ussher, Stillingfleet, and Camden. The learned Lipsius' opinion of this tradition, in his letter to Mr. Camden, will be found in his *Epistles*, page 64. The tradition, however, is not mentioned by Gildas, Nennius, or Bede. Our correspondent will find a long discussion on this disputed point in Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, August 18, Art. "S. Helen." See also Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, t. iv. Ed. N. & Q.—(Vol. iv. p. 154.)

CHRISTIANITY FIRST INTRODUCED INTO ORKNEY.

Christianity is believed to have been introduced into Orkney before the Norwegian conquest by King Harold Harfager, in 895; but the race who inhabited the country at that period are said to have been extirpated or driven out by the Scandinavians, who were worshippers of Odin and Thor. In the end of the tenth century the King of Nor-

way, Olaf Tryggveson, renounced Paganism for Christianity, which he forced both on Norway and Orkney at the point of the sword; M. Depping, in his *Histoire des Expéditions Maritimes des Normands*, tom. ii. p. 60. ed. 1826, states that Sigurd, the second Earl of Orkney (whose brother Ronald, Earl of Mære, the first Norwegian Earl of Orkney, was the common ancestor of the Earls of Orkney and Dukes of Normandy), drove the Christians out of Orkney. This was towards the beginning of the tenth century. It has been overlooked by Barry, the local historian, or unknown to him, who mentions (p. 123.) the introduction by king Olaf Tryggveson as either the first introduction, or at least the final establishment of the Christian religion. I have looked into Torfæus' *Orcades*, the Orkneyinga Saga, and the Sagas of the two kings, Harold Harfager and Olaf Tryggveson, in Mr. Laing's translation of Snow's Hermskringla, and have not found the expulsion of the Christians by Sigurd mentioned in any of those works. Will some of your learned correspondents be so obliging as to point out M. Depping's authority for this fact? I have just now fallen in with a curious example of the rude Christianity of the Northmen, who worshipped both Thor and Christ, and the passage is perhaps worth quoting. Torfæus, in his *Orcades*, p. 15., mentions a Scandinavian chief called Helgius, who lived in Iceland about 888, and says:

"Christianis sacris quibus infans initiatus est, per totam vitam adhæsit, valde tamen in religionis articulis rudis; nam Thorem. ad ardua negotia, itineraque maritima feliciter expediunda invocandum, cætera Christum dictitavit, tanquam eum Thore divisum imperium habentem. Simile Witichendus Monachus et Sigebertus Gemlansensis, de Danis, in primis religionis incunabulis. prodidere."

W. H. F.—(Vol. iv. p. 439.)

It is capable of demonstration that Christianity was introduced into the Orkney Islands, or at least that missionaries were sent there, long previous to the invasion of Harold Harfagus. W. H. F. mentions that Depping, in the *Histoire des Expéditions Maritimes des Normands*, states

that Sigurd, the second nominally, though really the first earl, expelled the Christians from Orkney, and he requests to know Depping's authority; as the circumstance is not alluded to by Torfæus, the Orkneyinga-Saga, or Snorro Sturleson, and has been "either overlooked by Barry, or unknown to him."

The well-known "Diploma or Genealogical Deduction of the Earls of Orkney," written by the bishop of that diocese in the year 1406, and printed in Wallace's *Account of Orkney*, and in the appendices to Barry's *History*, and the Orkneyinga-Saga, is generally looked upon, from the circumstances under which it was drawn up, as an authentic document of considerable historical value. It is there mentioned, that the Norsemen found the islands inhabited by the Peti and Papé, whom they exterminated. But I transcribe the words of the Diploma:

"Hæc terra sive insularum patria Orcadie fuit inhabitata et culta, duabus nacionibus scilicet Peti et Pape, que due genera naciones fuerant destructe radicitus, ac penitus per Norwegenses de stirpe sive de tribu strenuissimi principis Rognaldi, qui sic sunt ipsias naciones aggressi, quod posteritas ipsarum nacionum Peti et Pape non remansit."

Though Chalmers (*Caledonia*, vol. i. p. 261.) is rather inclined to discredit the above account, it seems probable that those Papé were missionaries or priests, who were also found, under precisely the same name, in Iceland when that island was colonised by the Norsemen (Pinkerton's *Enquiry*, vol. ii. p. 297.). I have not my copy of Depping at present by me, and therefore am unable to say whether he explains his use of the word *Christians* in his mention of their expulsion. It may be that, without going into detail, he accepted, as proved, the identity of the Papé and the priests, and believed himself warranted in making the assertion. But perhaps he might have had some other authority of which I am ignorant, as he attributes the expulsion (according to W. H. F.) to Sigurd, whereas the words of the Diploma are, "per Norwegenses de stirpe sive de tribu strenuissimi principis Rognaldi," by no means limiting the deed to his (Rognald's) immediate successor, though in-

ferentially accusing Sigurd of participation. A careful consideration of the entire passage in Depping, and of his general style, may tend to show whether he relied merely on the Diploma, or whether he had some more definite authority.

I may mention that, though it has escaped W. H. F.'s observation, he will find, by referring to pp. 87. 116. 133., Headrick's edition, that Barry did not overlook the early Christianising of the Orkneys, and the extirpation of the Papé; although, seeing that the former is matter of history, and the latter was not a mere tradition in 1406, but derived from a more trustworthy source ("sicut *cronice* nostre clare demonstrant"), he is scarcely distinct enough, or decided in his inferences. It would be interesting to know what were those "cronice" appealed to by the bishop.

A. H. R.—(Vol. v. p. 111.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS TEMP. ELIZABETH AND JAMES.

On running over the pages of the Commons' Journals, many a little characteristic incident turns up, which you may possibly deem suitable to your pages.

Coughing down a member not allowed.—"Whoever hisseth or disturbeth any speech hereafter, shall be called to the bar. Growing upon Sir Lewis Lewknor's speech,"—that is, the practice gained strength during his speech. (2 James I., June 20.)

Absenteeism.—This was most rigorously denied, except by special leave for attending assizes or other public matters. The following permission being accompanied by a stipulated *honorarium*, suggests that the cause of absence was regarded by the House as frivolous; "Sir Rob. Wroth hath leave to absent himself for a se'nnight, upon the king's hunting in the forest; hath leave, paying a buck to Mr. Speaker." (June 12, 2 James I.)

A Lawyer outvoted by a Jackdaw.—This was in a case for a "bill for costs in a prohibition," which was "dashed upon the division of the House;" for "a jackdaw flew in at the

window during his (Mr. Fuller's) speech, which was called *omen* to the bill." (May 31.)

Bill against costly Apparel.—Mr. Brook's speech for this bill (18 Jac. I.) is a prose version of the *New Courtier's Alteration*, or second part of what is now called the *Old Country Gentleman*. He attributes to extravagance in dress, decay of the public treasure, the ceasing of old-fashioned hospitality, the debts of knights and gentlemen; and what he terms the inequality of trade, importation and exportation. (Only think of) "18*l.* a year by a great courtier for shoe-strings!" Now-a-days, roses worn by Members of this House on their shoes cost more than did their fathers' apparel; and he concludes by observing, that gilding and lace are clothing neither for winter nor summer; Scripture teaching us that man's first covering, even by the gift of heaven, was nothing but skins.

Quoting Latin.—The trick so common among the members at that time of dragging in Latin upon all occasions, was a fashion strengthened, if not set on foot, by the king's pedantry. It was all very well in Sir Francis Bacon and such as he, but must have been insufferable when Sir Roger Owen could not allude to a straight line, without adding; "Brevissima extensio a puncto ad punctum." The greatest array of Latinisms occurs in the numerous debates about the Union of Scotland and England, which being a pet project of James's would of course attract his eye. But (independently of the quackery here referred to) it is worth adding, that if the disjointed jottings-down of these brief but energetic debates touching Scotland were judiciously linked into continuous dialogue, they would bring out an array of facts and arguments more instructive than whole chapters of formal history-writing.

N.B.—There are two different diaries of the first five years of James.

Fulsome Homage towards the King.—This it must be confessed showed itself more in words than in deeds; but the words are often inexcusably extravagant, and James is perpetually referred to as guided by maxims and influenced

by a motive power unknown to common men. Sir George Moore said, "They could not follow a better guide than his Majesty; though, like Peter, afar off." (March 19, 21 James I.) A more glaring instance of abject homage could hardly be furnished than by the examination of Edward Floyd, Esq., for speaking jeeringly of the Queen of Bohemia, James's daughter. One member after another starts up and proposes some cruel or grotesque form of punishment; such as boring the tongue, pillory, fining, flogging, riding backwards on horseback with his beads and friar's girdle about him. Sir George Goring moved for "twelve rides on an ass, at every stage to swallow a bead, and twelve jerks to make him." "As he laughed at the loss of Prague, therefore let him cry by whipping." Sir Edward Wardour: "as many lashes as the Prince and Princess are old." Mr. Angell: "A gag in his mouth to keep him from crying and procuring pity." Sir Francis Seymour of Marlborough delivered his judgment as follows: "To go from Westminster at a cart's tail, with his doublet off, to the Tower; the beads about his neck, and to receive as many lashes by the way as he had beads." It is satisfactory to add, that the merciful part of the House prevailed; and though the riding backwards and fining were inflicted, there was "no blood." James, in one of his messages to the Commons, tells them that "he was infinite, and his occasions infinite" (vol. i. p. 946.); but the House, without presuming to question this modest attribute, do not appear to have considered it necessary to promise a corresponding "subsidy."

Act against Scandalous and Unworthy Divines. — This, which is usually attributed to the Long Parliament, was first brought forward under James I. (April 28, 1621.)

The Long-bow versus *the Gun.*—An act, in 1621, for the preservation of game is based on the now "inordinate shooting in pieces;" but it was opposed as absurd, the long-bow being now an obsolete weapon, and "guns being the service of the state:" meaning thereby that the practice of gun-shooting was valuable, however acquired. Yet, though the long-

bow is declared obsolete at the period here mentioned, it is certain that at the commencement of the civil wars, twenty years later, it was an arm by no means neglected by the parliament. It may also be remembered, that Sir Walter Scott has introduced its use into the *Legend of Montrose* in 1643, greatly to the contempt of Dugald Dalgetty.

Purity of Elections.—Mr. Noy, on this point, tells the House a story of Lord Bruce of Bremberghe, for only uttering the word *reminiscar* by way of threat to one Roger a Baron of the Exchequer, being adjudged: To go up and down Westminster Hall, in his hose and doublet, without his hat; to go to all the courts, and then to go to the Tower. "And fit it were," he then adds, "that these men (divers Yorkshire constables), for forestalling freedom of election, and terrifying men with as much as *reminiscar*, should go to the Tower." Then, as to the qualification of voters, there is abundant evidence that electors in boroughs always lost their right by non-residence; and it was not till the 13th Elizabeth that an attempt was made by a bill to give "validity to burgesses *non resiant*,"—the term *burgesses* here meaning representatives. And the independence of cities and towns is illustrated by the unchallenged assertion of a member, in 1604, that the interference of a sheriff would be tantamount to "the disinherison of any corporation."

Plan for keeping Members to their Seats.—"Ordered: That if, after the reading of the first bill, any of the House depart before the rising of Mr. Speaker, to pay to the poor men's box four pence." (Nov. 9, 9 Elizabeth.)

J. W.—(Vol. xii. p. 138.)

KING JOHN AT LINCOLN.

Matthew Paris, under the year 1200, gives an account of King John's visiting Lincoln to meet William, king of Scots, and to receive his homage:

"Ubi Rex Johannes [he says], contra consilium multorum,

intravit civitatem intrepidus, quod nullus antecessorum suorum attentare ausus fuerat."

What were they afraid of?

C. W. B.—(Vol. iii. p. 141.)

There is no question of Matt. Paris alluding here to the old prophecy which forbade a king's wearing his crown in Lincoln, or, as some think, even entering the city. Although he makes John the first to break through the superstition, yet the same is attributed to his predecessor Stephen, who is described by H. Huntingdon as entering the city fearlessly—"prohibentibus quibusdam superstitiosis." This was after the great disasters of Stephen's reign; but as the succession eventually departed from his line, Lord Lyttleton observes that the citizens might nevertheless be strengthened in their credulity; and Henry II. certainly humoured it so far as to wear his crown only in the suburb of Wigford. John seems to have been very partial to the place, and visited it repeatedly, as did many of his successors. Many parallel superstitions might, no doubt, be gathered, as that of Oxford, and Alexander the Great at Babylon, &c. B.—(Vol. iii. p. 291.)

LANDING OF WILLIAM III.

The following notes appeared in reply to a query as to the date of the landing of this Prince.

The Prince of Orange arrived in Torbay on the eve of the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot; but, according to Burnet (who was on board one of the prince's ships), it appears that, "The 4th of November being the day on which the prince was born and married, he fancied that if he could land that day it would look auspicious to the army, and animate the soldiers. But we all, who considered that the day following being Gunpowder Treason day, our landing that day might have a good effect on the minds of the English nation, were better pleased to see that we could land no sooner." (Harl. MS. 6798, art. 49.) See also

Trevor's *Life and Times of William III.*, vol. i. p. 281., who says, "On the 4th, the fleet continued to steer their course in order to land at Dartmouth or Torbay. During the night the violence of the wind carried them beyond the desired port; but a favourable change taking place the following morning the whole fleet was safely carried into Torbay, a place in everyway most suited for landing the Horse." (Vol. x. p. 424.)

Seeing a question about the landing of the Prince of Orange on Nov. 5, I though perhaps the following extracts might be amusing. They are from a book entitled:

"The History of the Desertion; or an Account of all the Publick Affairs in England, from the beginning of September, 1688, to the Twelfth of February following. By a Person of Quality: London, 1689."

"And when all men expected the invasion would fall on the north, the third of November, between ten and eleven of the clock, the Dutch fleet was discovered about half seas over, between Calice and Dover; and about five, this numerous fleet was passed by that town, steering a channel course westward, the wind at E. N. E., a fresh gale. The fourth day being Sunday, and the birthday of the Prince of Orange, the fleet drove till four in the afternoon; the morning being spent in sermons, and other divine offices. And then it sailed again to the westward. The fifth of November, the Dutch fleet passed by Dartmouth; and it being a hazy foggy morning, and full of rain, they overshot Torbay, where the Prince intended to land; but about nine of the clock, the weather cleared up, and the wind changed W. S. W., and the fleet stood eastward, with a moderate gale, entering Torbay, and being then about 400 or 500 sail in number. This change of the wind was observed by Dr. Burnet to have been of no long duration; but immediately it chopped into another corner, when it had executed its commission."

Auceps.—(Vol. x. p. 631.)

ANECDOTE OF GEORGE IV. AND THE DUKE OF YORK.

The following letter was written in a boy's round hand, and sent with some China cups:

Dear Old Mother Batten,

Prepare a junket for us, as Fred. and I are coming this

evening. I send you these cups, which we have stolen from the old woman [the queen]. Don't you say anything about it. GEORGE.

The above was found in the bottom of one of the cups, which were sold for five guineas on the death of Mr. Nichols, who married Mother Batten. The cups are now in possession of a Mr. Toby, No. 10. York Buildings, St. Sidwells, Exeter. JULIA R. BOCKETT.—(Vol. ix. p. 244.)

I think it probable that the writer refers not to the Queen but to Mrs. Schwellenberg, an old German lady, who came over with the late queen as a confidential domestic, and who would have such articles under her keeping. (See *Diary of Madame D'Arblay.*) The transaction is a notable instance of the prince's forethought and liberality at an early age. W. H.—(Vol. ix. p. 338.)

LORD STRAFFORD AND ARCHBISHOP USSHER.

In Lord Campbell's account of the conduct of Archbishop Williams, and the advice which that prelate gave to Charles I. with respect to the attainder of Lord Strafford, is a sentence which seems to require a "Note." Having observed that "Williams's conduct with respect to Strafford cannot be defended," and having referred particularly to his speech in parliament, he proceeds in these words:—

"The Bill of Attainder being passed, although he professed to disapprove of it, he agreed to go with three other prelates to try to induce the king to assent to it, and thus he stated the question:—'Since his Majesty refers his own judgment to his judges, and they are to answer it, if an innocent person suffers,—why may he not satisfy his conscience in the present matter, since competent judges in the law have awarded that they find the Earl guilty of treason, by suffering the judgment to stand, though in his own mind he is satisfied that the party convicted was not criminous?' The other three bishops, trusting to his learning and experience, joined with him in sanctioning this distinction, in laying all the blame on the judges, and in saying that the king, with a good conscience, might agree to Strafford's death. Clarendon mainly imputes Strafford's death to Williams's conduct on this occasion, saying that 'he acted his part with pro-

digious boldness and impiety.' It is stated as matter of palliation by others, that Ussher, the celebrated Archbishop of Armagh, was one of this deputation, and that Strafford, although aware of the advice he had given, was attended by him on the scaffold, and received from him the last consolations of religion."—*Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. ii. p. 494., second edition.

The account which Lord Campbell has here given is the same in substance as that given by Bishop Hackett in his *Life of Williams* (Part II. p. 161.), and in several particulars is calculated to mislead the reader. The whole story has been very carefully examined by the late Dr. Elrington in his *Life of Archbishop Ussher*. Hackett's account is very incorrect. There were five prelates consulted by the king, Ussher, Williams, Juxon, Morton (Durham), and Potter (Carlisle). The bishops had two interviews with the king; one in the morning, and the other in the evening of the same day. At the morning meeting Ussher was not present. It was Sunday, and he was engaged at the time preaching at Covent Garden. In the evening he was in attendance, but so far from giving the advice suggested by Williams, much less approving his pernicious distinction between a public and a private conscience, Ussher plainly advised the king, that if he was not satisfied of Strafford being guilty of treason, he "ought not in conscience to assent to his condemnation." Such is the account given by Dr. Parr, Ussher's chaplain, who declares, that, when the primate was supposed to be dying, he asked his Grace—

"Whether he had advised the king to pass the bill against the Earl of Strafford? To which the Primate answered: 'I know there is such a thing most wrongfully laid to my charge; for I neither gave nor approved of any such advice as that the king should assent to the bill against the Earl; but, on the contrary, told his Majesty, that if he was satisfied by what he heard at his trial, that the Earl was not guilty of treason, his Majesty ought not in conscience to consent to his condemnation. And this the king knows well enough, and can clear me if he pleases.' The hope of the Primate was fulfilled, for when a report reached Oxford that the Primate was dead, the king expressed in very strong terms to Colonel William Legg and Mr. Kirk, who were then in waiting, his regret at the event, speaking in high

terms of his piety and learning. Some one present said, 'he believed he might be so, were it not for his persuading your Majesty to consent to the Earl of Strafford's execution;' to which the king in a great passion replied, 'that it was false, for after the bill was passed, the Archbishop came to me, saying with tears in his eyes, Oh Sir, what have you done? I fear that this act may prove a great trouble to your conscience, and pray God that your Majesty may never suffer by the signing of this bill.'" — Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 214.

This account Dr. Elrington has taken from the narrative given by Dr. Parr, who adds, that he had received this account of the testimony borne by the king from Colonel Legg and Mr. Kirk themselves :—

"This is the substance of two certificates, taken at divers times under the hands of these two gentlemen of unquestionable credit; both which, since they agree in substance I thought fit to contract into one testimony, which I have inserted here, having the originals by me, to produce if occasion be." — Parr's *Life of Ussher*, p. 61.

Indeed, considering the great and uninterrupted friendship which subsisted between Ussher and Strafford, considering that the primate was his chosen friend during his trial and imprisonment, and attended him to the scaffold, nothing could be more improbable than that he should have advised the king to consent to his death. At all events, the story is contradicted by those most competent to speak to its truth, by the archbishop and by the king; and therefore, in a work so deservedly popular as Lord Campbell's, one cannot but regret that any currency should be given to a calumny so injurious to a prelate whose character is as deserving of our esteem as his learning is of our veneration.

PEREGRINUS.—(Vol. iv. p. 290.)

The question raised by PEREGRINUS is one of interest which a comparison of original and trustworthy writers enables us soon to settle. It is no vulgar calumny which implicates Ussher in the advice which induced Charles I. to consent to the murder of Lord Strafford; and though it seems not unlikely that from timidity Ussher avoided giving

any advice, but allowed it to be inferred that he coincided in the counsel of Williams: after weighing the evidence on this subject it is, to say the least, impossible for us to believe for an instant that he acted in the same noble manner as Bishop Juxon. Thus far is clear, that Bishop Juxon, knowing that the king was satisfied of the innocence of Lord Strafford, besought him to refuse to allow of the execution, and to "trust God with the rest." Neither is it denied that Bishops Williams, Potter, and Morton advised the king to assent to the bill of attainder, on the ground that he was only assenting to the deeds of others, and was not himself acting responsibly. And assuredly the same evidence which carries us thus far, will not allow of our supposing that Ussher joined with Juxon, though, as I have said before, he may, when summoned, have avoided giving any advice. The facts seem simply these: when it was known that the king, satisfied of the innocence of Lord Strafford, hesitated about affixing his signature to the bill, or granting a commission to others to do so, the London rabble, lord mayor, and 'prentice lads were next called up, and the safety of the royal family menaced. This led to the queen's solicitation, that Charles would regard the lives of his family and sacrifice Strafford. Still the king could not be moved. He had scruples of conscience, as well he might. This the peers knowing, they *selected* four bishops who would satisfy these scruples: the four thus selected were Ussher, Williams, Morton, and Potter. On Sunday morning, the 9th of May, the *four* should have proceeded to Whitehall: the *three* latter did so; but Ussher preferred the safer course of going and preaching at St. Paul's. Covent Garden, leaving to his brother bishops the task of distinguishing between the king's private conscience and his corporate one. The king, not satisfied to leave the matter in the hands of those specially selected to urge his consent, summoned the Privy Council. Juxon was present as Lord Treasurer, and gave that noble and truly Christian advice: "Sir, you know the judgment of your own conscience; I beseech you follow that, and trust God with the rest." Moved by this, and by his own

conviction of Strafford's innocence, the king still refused assent; and it was needful to hold another meeting, which was done in the evening of the same day. As evening service had not been introduced into churches, Ussher was present at the palace, and by his silence acquiesced in the advice tendered by Bishop Williams. After the bill was signed, he broke silence in useless regrets. But it was then too late to benefit Strafford, and quite safe to utter his own opinions. In opposition to this, which rests upon indisputable evidence, and with which Ussher's own statement entirely accords, PEREGRINUS adduces the fact that Ussher attended Strafford on the scaffold. But what does this prove? Merely that the faction which would not tolerate that Laud or Juxon should minister the last offices of the Church to their dying friend, did not object to Ussher's presence; and that Strafford, who could have known nothing of what had passed on Sunday in the interior of Whitehall, gladly accepted the consolations of religion from the hands of the timid Primate of all Ireland.

The substance of what appears in Elrington's *Life of Ussher* had been long before stated by Dr. Thomas Smith, in his *Vita Jacobi Usserii*, apud *Vitæ quorundam Erudit et Illust. Virorum*; but if, in addition, PEREGRINUS would consult May's *History of the Long Parliament*; Echard's *History of England*, bk. ii. ch. i.; Whitelocke's *Memorials*, p. 45.; Rushworth; Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, t. ii. p. 801.; Dr. Knowler, in Preface to *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches*; Dr. South, in *Sermon on Rom.* xi. 33.; and Sir George Radcliffe's Essay in Appendix to *Letters, &c., of Lord Strafford*, t. ii. p. 432., I doubt not but that he will come to the conclusion that the above sketch is only consistent with stern fact.

W. DN.—(Vol. iv. p. 349.)

SONS OF THE CONQUEROR.

Sir N. W. Wraxall (*Posthumous Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 425.) says of the Duke of Dorset: —

"His only son perished at twenty-one in an Irish foxchase: a mode of dying not the most glorious or distinguished, though two sons of William the Conqueror, one of whom was a King of England, terminated their lives in a similar occupation."

Who are these *two* sons? William Rufus would be one of them; but who is the other? And *on what authority* does the commonly received story of William II.'s death by the hand of Sir Walter Tyrrell rest?

TEWARS.—(Vol. v. p. 512.)

Richard, second Son of the Conqueror, is said by Hume, and by some minor writers after him, to have been killed by a stag in the New Forest; but William of Malmesbury and Roger of Wendover both say that he died of fever, consequent on malaria, which struck him while hunting there. This is well known to be of frequent occurrence in the neighbourhood of desolated human dwellings; and thus seems to involve even a more striking instance of retributive justice than the fate which Hume assigns to him. The fatality attending most of this name in our history is singular. Of nine princes (three of them kings) who have borne the name of Richard, seven, or, if Hume is right, eight, have died violent deaths, including four successive generations of the House of York.

J. S. WARDEN.—(Vol. v. p. 441.)

No son of William the Conqueror, except William Rufus, was slain by an arrow in the New Forest. A grandson, however, of the Conqueror, Richard, son of Robert Duke of Normandy, met with the same fate as Rufus, as stated by the contemporary chronicler, Florentius Wigornensis. (Edition of the Historical Society, vol. ii. p. 45.) Immediately after describing the death of William Rufus, he says: —

"Nam et antea ejusdem Willelmi junioris germanus Ricardus, in eadem foresta multo ante perierat, et paulo ante *suus fratruelis*, Ricardus, comitis scilicet Normannorum Roberti filius, dum et ipse in venatu fuisset, a suo milite sagitta percussus, interiit."

Probably Sir N. Wraxall or his authority had read this statement hastily, and had construed *fratruelis* brother instead of *nephew*, which is the correct sense of the word.

Every historian of that day — Florentius Wigornensis and the Saxon chronicler among others — gives the received account of his death, except Suger, a Norman abbot, who says that Sir W. Tyrrell took a solemn oath to him that he was not the slayer of the king, but that the arrow came from an unknown hand.

There can, I think, be little doubt but that Sir W. Tyrrell's was the hand that drew the bow; whether, however, he intended to kill the king or not, is a point which it is probable, after the time that has elapsed, will never be satisfactorily determined. R. C. C.—(Vol. v. p. 570.)

CLARENCE.

The title CLARENCE was, we learn from Camden (*Britannia*, edit. Gough, vol. ii. pp. 73, 74.), derived from the honour of Clare, in Suffolk; and was *first* borne by Lionel Plantagenet, third son of Edward III., who married Elizabeth de Burgh, daughter and heir of William, Earl of Ulster, and obtained with her the honour of Clare. He became, *jure uxoris*, Earl of Ulster, and was created, September 15, 1362, Duke of Clarence. (Vol. viii. p. 565.)

WHERE WAS THE FIRST PRINCE OF WALES BORN?

The following note appeared in reply to a query (vol. vi. p. 270.) on this subject.

In the *Journal of the Archæological Institute* for September, 1850 (No. 27.), is a paper by the Rev. C. H. Hartshorne upon Caernarvon Castle. In it will be found a very interesting account of the noble building to which it refers,

founded upon *data* which have been too long neglected in the consideration of such matters, and in opposition to which romantic tradition should be allowed to have no weight whatever, — the public records of the kingdom. Painful as it may be to some to contemplate the downfall of such traditions as that of Edward II.'s birth in the Eagle Tower, historic truth is of greater consequence to all. It will be seen by Mr. Hartshorne's paper, that the tower was not built till Edward of Caernarvon was thirty-three years of age. But the cognomen is nevertheless correct. The first Prince of Wales was certainly born in the town of Caernarvon; and most probably in some building temporarily erected for the accommodation of the royal household.

J. Bt.—(Vol. vi. p. 373.)

NELSON'S FUNERAL.

The following account of Nelson's Funeral appeared in vol. vi. p. 333.

The "Victory," with the remains of the ever-to-be-lamented Nelson, arrived off Sheerness, Sunday, December 22, 1805.

The body was placed the following morning on board the "Chatham" yacht, proceeding on her way to Greenwich. The coffin, covered with an ensign, was placed on deck. Tuesday she arrived at Greenwich; the body, still being in the coffin made of the wreck of "L'Orient," was then enveloped in the colours of the "Victory," bound round by a piece of rope, and carried by sailors, part of the crew of the "Victory," to the Painted Hall, where preparations were made for the lying in state; the days appointed for which were Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, January 5, 6, and 7, 1806, and to which all due effect was given. Wednesday, January 8, the first day's procession by water took place, and the remains were removed from Greenwich to Whitehall, and from thence to the Admiralty, with all possible pomp and solemnity. This procession of barges, &c. was

nearly a mile long, minute guns being fired during its progress. The banner of emblems was borne by Captain Hardy, Lord Nelson's captain. The body was deposited that night in the captain's room at the Admiralty, and attended by the Rev. John Scott.

Thursday, January 9, 1806, the procession from the Admiralty to St. Paul's moved forward about eleven o'clock in the morning, the first part consisting of cavalry regiments, regimental bands with muffled drums, Greenwich pensioners, seamen from the "Victory," about 200 mourning coaches, 400 carriages of public officers, nobility, &c., including those of the royal family (the Prince of Wales, Duke of Clarence, &c. taking part in the procession). The body, upon a funeral car, was drawn by six led horses. At Temple Bar, the city officers took their places in the procession. Upon arrival at the cathedral, they entered by the west gate and the great west door, ranging themselves according to their ranks. The seats were as follows: under the dome, in each archway, in the front of the piers, and in the gallery over the choir. The form of the seats under the dome took the shape of the dome, namely, a circular appearance, and calculated to hold 3056 persons; an iron railing was also placed from the dome to the great western door, within which persons were allowed to stand. The body was placed on a bier, erected on a raised platform opposite to the eagle desk. At the conclusion of the service in the choir, a procession was formed from thence to the grave, with banners, &c. The interment being over, Garter proclaimed the style; and the comptroller, treasurer, and steward of the deceased, breaking their staves, gave the pieces to Garter, who threw them into the grave.

The procession, arranged by the officers of arms, then returned.

For a few days after the public were admitted upon a shilling fee, and permitted to enter the enclosed spot directly over the body, looking down a distance of about ten feet, and were gratified with a sight of the coffin, placed upon a sort of table covered with black cloth.

THE LAST JACOBITES.

In vol. x. p. 507., R. C. C. writes as follows: —

In a recent number of *Household Words* (No. 241. Nov. 4, 1854) is an article on the last of the Stuarts, the Cardinal York. It concludes as follows: —

"The Cardinal Duke, *down to the very day of his death*, although in the receipt of a munificent pension from England, was in communication with *several noblemen* who still indulged the hope of placing him upon the throne of Great Britain. Among the Cardinal's papers were discovered letters from active partisans both in Ireland and Scotland; but the English government wisely took no notice of these awkward revelations. Had they done so, *many men of high rank and great influence would have been brought to a severe account.*"

Who (if the parts of the quotation which I have marked in italics are correct) were the "noblemen," the "men of high rank and great influence," who continued to cherish hopes of a Stuart restoration down to 1807, the year of Cardinal York's death?

I doubt whether any Jacobites were left in Scotland in 1807, except a few decrepit old men, the remnant of those who had been "out in '45," and these could not be described as men of great influence. It seems strange, too, that so exemplary a person as Cardinal York, when he bequeathed his papers to his kinsman and benefactor George III., should not have taken some precautions to have all those destroyed which compromised any of his adherents who were then living as British subjects.

These queries produced the following replies: —

Valentine Lord Cloncurry was a nobleman who was on very intimate terms with Cardinal York. Whether he was one who "indulged the hope of placing him upon the throne of Great Britain" or not, I cannot say. But it looks suspicious, when we bear in mind that as a young man he joined, heart and soul, the anti-government party, was a United Irishman, became a member of the Executive-directory of the United Irish Society, wrote a pamphlet, and becoming an object of government suspicion, was ar-

rested in 1798, and examined several times before the privy council. A twelve-month later the government again arrested him, and kept him in the Tower for two years. In his autobiography, amongst some sketches of his visits to France and Italy, he thus speaks of the last of the Stuarts:—

"Amongst the prominent members of Roman society in those days was the last of the Stuarts, Cardinal York, with whom I became somewhat of a favourite, probably by virtue of addressing him as 'Majesty,' and thus going a step farther than the Duke of Sussex, who was on familiar terms with him, and always applied to him the style of Royal Highness. . . . . Upon the occasion of my visit to Frascati, I presented the cardinal with a telescope, which he seemed to fancy, and received from him in return the large medal struck in honour of his accession to his unsubstantial throne. Upon one side of this medal was the royal bust, with the cardinal's hat, and the words 'Henricus nonus Dei gratia rex;' and upon the other the arms of England, with the motto on the exergue, 'Haud desideriis hominum, sed voluntate Dei.'"—*Personal Recollections of the Life and Times, &c., of Lord Cloncurry:* Dublin, McGlashan.

CEYREP.—(Vol. xi. p. 53.)

In spite of Valentine Lord Cloncurry, with his obnoxious pamphlet, his connexion with the "United Irishmen," and his friendship for the Cardinal de York, I cannot help believing that your correspondent R. C. C. is correct in the view he takes of the Jacobites as they existed in 1807. I could have wished the accomplished writer in *Household Words* to have given us his authorities. As he has not done so, a few remarks from me may not be deemed intrusive.

In Mr. R. Chambers' *History of the Rebellion of* 1745-6, we find the Cardinal de York described as "a mild, inoffensive man." We know that when in 1747 he was made Cardinal, the exiled Jacobites regarded his advancement as the final destruction of their hopes. Many of them did not scruple to "declare it of much worse consequence to them than even the battle of Culloden." (Mahon's *History of England*, vol. iii. p. 349.) From this time the Cardinal devoted himself to church affairs. On his brother's death, in 1788, the only steps he took towards declaring his title

to the English throne, was to have a declaration read publicly, which had been prepared in 1784, when Charles was thought to be dying; and a medal struck, with the inscription, "Hen. ix. Ang. Rex," with the addition "Dei Gratia, sed non voluntate hominum." Surely the latter part of this inscription must have sounded as a satire to his ears, and to those of the adherents of his house who still remained.

Both Lord Mahon and Mr. Chambers consider the Jacobite party as *crushed* by the battle of Culloden. The executions on Tower Hill, and the wholesale butchery on Kennington Common, destroyed the strength of the friends of Charles, although Jacobitism existed as a sentiment much later. "But it became identified with the weakness of old age." It was a thing of the past. Tory rectors and country gentlemen were still wont to toast Prince Charles, just as their fathers had toasted the Chevalier St. George. They were vehement in their abuse of the House of Hanover, and in their admiration of the House of Stuart. But we obtain a fair estimate of the value of their good wishes in the case of Dr. Johnson. He confessed to Boswell that "the pleasure of cursing the House of Hanover and drinking King James's health was amply overbalanced by 300*l.* a year."

It appears to me that the writer in *Household Words* has confounded the lingering sentiment of 1788 (the date of Charles's death) with the active partisanship of 1745. Until he can prove his case against the "exemplary Cardinal," we must consider his statements as overstrained.

J. Virtue Wynen.—(Vol. xi. p. 169.)

INDEX.

INDEX.

Anne Boleyn, a prisoner in the Tower, 66.
where was she buried ? 119.
Anne of Cleves, her divorce from Henry VIII., 82.
Athelney, 68.
Athelstan, 79.

Bannockburn, battle of, 13.
Bartolomeo Della Nave's collection of pictures, 168.
Battles, England's, last survivors of, 171.
Beauchamp, Henry, crowned king of Guernsey and Jersey, 28.
Bothwell created Duke of Orkney, 37.
his marriage contract with Mary Queen of Scots, 36.
Bradoch Down, Battle of, 279.
Bruce, captivity of his queen, 9.
Brunanburgh, Battle of, 77.
Buchan, Countess of, condemned to be encaged at Berwick Castle, 12.
places the crown on the head of Bruce, 10.

Calais, siege of, 204.
Caroline Matilda, sister of George III., 22.
Chamartin, inquisition at, 189.
Chancellors, two at the same time, 42.
Charlemagne's talisman, 32.
Charles I., anecdote of, 185.
Bartolomeo Della Nave's collection of pictures, 168.
crown, 261.
Charles I., execution of, 225.
letter, 207.
letter to Chief Justice Heath, 17.
Charles II., his crown, 262.
in Wales, 270.
Charles, Prince, his attendants in Spain, 266.
Charlotte, Queen, first impressions of, 3.
Chatham, Baroness of, created, 5.
Chatham, Lord, original letter written on the resignation of Mr. Pitt, 3.
Christianity first introduced into Orkney, 290.
Clarence, origin of the title, 305.
Clarendon's account of Hampden's death, 30.
Cleves, Anne of, divorce from Hen. VIII., 82.
Clusian dynasty at Rome, 112.
Confessor to the royal household, 20.
Contributions for defence of the parliament, 1642, 51.
Convocation in the reign of George II., 227.
Crecy, cannon used at, 242.
Cromwell, birth and baptism, 228.
burial, 216.
crown, 262.
dealings with the devil, 212.
private amours, 214.
feoffee of Parson's charity, Ely, 206.
poisoned, 211.
his skull, 232.
veterans, 171.

Crowns, remarks on, by Stephen Martin Leake, Esq., Garter, 248.
Culloden, A.D. 1746, 174.
Culloden, — regimental colours burnt by the common hangman after, 86.
Curwen, Sir Thomas, 43.
Defender of the Faith, 218.
Denmark, Orkney Islands in pawn from, 139.
Dettingen, 1743, 173.

Edgehill, 175.
Edward the Confessor's crown, 250.
his ring, 268.
Edward I., crown, 255.
punishes the Prince of Wales for disrespect to a judge, 73.
Edward II., crown, 255.
Edward III., crown, 256.
surrender of Calais, 204.
Edward IV., crown, 258.
Edward V., birthplace, 266.
Edward VI., crown, 260.
Edward of Lancaster, autograph of, 21.
Edward, Prince of Wales, son of Edward I., his punishment for disrespect to a judge, 72.
Elizabeth, alleged bastardy of, 109.
crown, 261.
description of, 269.
lock of her hair, 89.
and Sir Henry Nevill, 167.
and Sir Philip Sidney, 89.
England's great battles, the last survivors of, 170.
English sovereigns, lists of, 83.
Eustache de Saint Pierre, 204.

Fire of London, surveyor's account of, 18.
and plague of London, predictions of, 234.
Fontenoy, 1745, 174.

George II., convocation in his reign, 227.
George III., baptism, marriage, and crowning, 28.
sister, 22.
George IV., anecdote of, 298.
last days, 227.
Gibraltar, capture of, 1704, 172.
Gray, Lord, accompanies the Duke of Monmouth in his flight, 2.
Grenville, Sir Beville, letter from, 279.
Grey, Lady Jane, 83.
Lady Katherine, committed to the Tower, 210.
Guernsey, Lambert a prisoner in, 155.
and Jersey, Henry Beauchamp crowned king of, 28.

Hampden's death, 29.
Sir Philip Warwick's account of, 30.
Hannibal, Malta his burial-place, 177.
Hanno, the Carthaginian, 131.
Heath, Chief Justice, letter from Charles I. to, 17.
Helena, the empress, 289.
Henry I., crown, 252.
Henry II., crown, 253.
Henry III., crown, 254.
Henry IV., crown, 257.
Henry V., crown, 257.
Henry VI., capture, 244.
crown, 258.
Henry VII., crown, 259.
Henry VIII. and Sir Thomas Curwen, 43.
proclamation of, against religious books, 45.
letter from, to James V. of Scotland, 80.
his divorce from Anne of Cleves, 82.
capital punishments in his reign, 164.
crown, 260.

House of Commons, temp. Elizabeth and James, 293.

Inquisition at Madrid, 187.
Isabel, queen of the Isle of Man, 179.
Isle of Wight, king of, 27.

Jacobites, the last, 308.
James I., crown, 261.
James II., abdication, 246.
remains, 121.
James V. of Scotland, letter to, from Henry VIII., 80.

John (King), crown, 254.
at Lincoln, 296.
king of France, journal of his expenses in England, 1359–60, 69.
Josephine, birthplace of the empress, 23.

Kerbester, battle of, 14.

Lambert, the "Arch Rebell," 155.
Larges, battle of, 140.
Leake, Stephen Martin, remarks on crowns, 248.
Leicester and the reputed poisoners of his time, 129.
Lesly, Lieut.-Gen., at the battle of Kerbester, 14.
Londonderry, battle of, 175.
London, great fire, surveyor's account of, 18.
fire and plague of, 234.
the riots, 145.

Mackay, John Ross, 65.
Madrid, inquisition at, 186.
Malta, the burial-place of Hannibal, 177.
Man, Isle of, Isabel, queen of, 179.
Margaret of Anjou, 21.
Marlborough, soldiers serving under, 172.
Mary, Queen, crown, 261.
her expectations, 34.
Mary, Queen of Scots, marriage-contract with Bothwell, 36.
her chair, 105.
her monument and head, 86.
Maud (Empress), crown, 252.
Monmouth's Ash, 1.
Monmouth Close, history of, 2.
Monmouth's execution, 28. 90.
gives six guineas to his executioner, 28.
and the electors of Hull, 29.
memorials of his last days, 89.
pocket-book, 89. 94. 99.
Montrose, capture of, after the battle of Kerbester, 15.

Namur, siege of, 1695, 172.
Napoleon, St. Lucia first selected for his exile, 27.
Napoleon III. in possession of Charlemagne's talisman, 32.
Naseby Field, Cromwell buried at, 217.
Nelson, his death, 229.
funeral, 306.
letter 16 days before Trafalgar, 280.
Nevill, Sir Henry, and Elizabeth, 167.
Nicolas, Sir Harry, his account of the abdication of James II., 246.

Orkney, Christianity first introduced into, 290.
Islands in pawn, 139.
Bothwell created duke of, 37.

Parliament, Commons, who advanced money, horses, &c. for defence of, 1642, 51.
Periplus of Hanno, 131.
Perkin Warbeck, 18.
Pitt, William, an annuity of £3,000 granted to him, 5.
Philippa (Queen) and the surrender of Calais, 204.
Porsena and the Clusian dynasty at Rome, 112.
the eighth king of Rome, 109.
Predictions of the Fire and Plague of London, 234.
Preston Pans, 176.
Prince of Wales, birthplace of the first, 286.
Princesses of Wales, 305.
Pye's, Sir Robert, account of Hampden's death, 31.

Quebec, taking of, 1759, 175.

Richard I., crown, 253.
Richard II., crown, 256.
Richard III., the day of his accession, 34.
crown, 258.
death, 285.
Riots of London, 145.
Rome, the four last kings of, 115.

Secker, Dr., baptized, crowned and married George III., 28.
Sedgmoor, battle of, 1685, 64,
Shaftesbury, letter from the late Earl of, respecting Monmouth's Ash, 1.

Sheriffmuir, 1715, 173.
Sidney, Sir Philip, and Elizabeth, 89.
Slavery in England, 134.
Sovereigns, English, list of, 83.
Spanish Armada, 176.
Stephen, his crown, 252.
St. Lucia the birthplace of the Empress Josephine, 23.
first selected for Napoleon's exile, 27.
State prison in the Tower, 67.
Strafford, Lord, and Archbishop Ussher, 299.
Survivors of England's great battles, 170.

Talisman of Charlemagne, 32.
Tewkesbury, battle of, 22.
Tower, the state prison in, 66.
Trafalgar, battle of, 229.
letter from Lord Nelson six days before, 280.

Ussher, Archbishop, and Lord Strafford, 299.

Villains, the last of these bondsmen, 134.
their manumission, 139.
Villers in Couchê, battle of, 272.

Wallace, William, his execution, 67.
Warbeck, Perkin, 19.
Warwick, Duke of, crowned King of the Isle of Wight, 27.
(Sir Philip), account of Hampden's death, 30.
Wentworth (Sir Henry), account of the landing of Perkin Warbeck, 18.
Wight, Isle of, 27.
William I., his crown, 251.
sons, 304.
William II., his crown, 251.
William III., his landing, 297.
Wolsey, Cardinal, in the stocks, 108.
his son, 120.
Worcester, anecdote of the battle of, 41.
Scotch prisoners at, 282.

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

BRIEF
D
0004844

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 09 10 03 14 002 1